CIVIL LIBERTY

ASSERTED,

AND THE

RIGHTS of the SUBJECT

DEFENDED,

AGAINST

The Anarchial PRINCIPLES of the Reverend Dr. PRICE.

In which his Sophiſtical Reaſonings, Dangerous Tenets, and Principles of Falſe Patriotiſm, contained in his OBSERVATIONS on CIVIL LIBERTY, &c. are Expoſed and Refuted.

In a LETTER to a GENTLEMAN in the COUNTRY.

By a FRIEND to the RIGHTS of the CONSTITUTION.

LONDON,
Printed for J. WILKIE, at No 71, in St. Paul's Church-Yard.
MDCCLXXVI.

DEDICATION.

TO THE

FRIENDS of LIBERTY,

AND THE

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS of GREAT-BRITAIN in general;

AND TO THE

GOVERNOR and COMPANY of the BANK of ENGLAND in particular.

GENTLEMEN,

IT is with the utmoſt concern I reflect on the dreadful evils of the war now carrying on in *America*; a concern which nothing can equal, but the ſurprize how the dreadful rebellion which occaſioned it ſhould find ſuch countenance and ſupport in *England*. Had not the rebellion in America been animated and encouraged at home, probably all diſcontent had long ſince ſubſided, to the mutual advantage of both par-

ties. However, it is certain the paſſions of ſome men are continually at war with their own happineſs, and therefore it is ſcarce to be expected they ſhould be at peace with any body elſe. But why the Author of the Obſervations, which occaſioned the following Remarks, ſhould ſtray from the quiet path of the occupation he had been long reputably engaged in, to enliſt in an ignominious corps, and fight under the banners of Factions and Traitors, is not eaſy to conceive. Surely neither the pleaſure, profit, nor honour of being *Toad-eater* to a great man, can be deemed an adequate recompence for aiding the cauſe of Rebels againſt the beſt of Sovereigns, in defiance of the Laws, and the Conſtitutional Rights of this kingdom. Let any one compare his book with the unconſtitutional Sermon of DR. SACHEVEREL, of moſt infamous memory, and they will find, comparatively ſpeaking, the latter without a blemiſh. Had the preſent SACHEVEREL poſſeſſed the animated powers of the former, his Book would have been the moſt poignant libel that ever appeared; but his powers, alas! are weak, in proportion to his will; and if the former had been as moderately ſtocked with diſcretion as the latter, I have not a doubt but he would

would have made his exit at Tyburn, in a halter.

We are told, in p. 93, "One of the moſt violent enemies of the Colonies has pronounced them 'all Mr. Locke's diſciples.' If that enemy, whoever he were, knew no more of the Colonies than he did of Mr. Locke's tenets, they had in him no formidable enemy; for I defy him, even aided by our Doctor, to produce a ſingle ſentence out of Mr. Locke, which, by fair conſtruction, gives the leaſt countenance to rebellion againſt a lawful Sovereign. The Doctor, in his ſecond Preface indeed, ſays his principles are agreeable to Mr. Locke's, and others the beſt Writers on the ſubject of Civil Liberty; or to this effect.

Who he means by others, the beſt Writers, I don't know, nor what they may have ſaid on the ſubject; but I ſhould be extremely glad to ſee this diſpute decided by Mr. Locke's principles. He had perhaps the preciſeſt notions of Civil Liberty of any man, and was as warm and as prevalent an advocate for it as lived; but he never called *that* Liberty which was oppoſed to lawful authority, nor any man a Patriot, who countenanced Rebellion againſt it. He well

knew Liberty could never ſubſiſt without a a ſupreme power to coerce a full obedience to the legiſlative authority of the State; and no Government can be exerciſed with juſtice, unleſs every the meaneſt ſubject is made to bear a proportionable ſhare of the burthen neceſſarily incident to it.

But admitting, for argument ſake, that the Doctor's prophecyings, prognoſtications, and enthuſiaſtic viſions are all real, and things *muſt* terminate as he ſays, what effect will his publications have on the people? —Why, if they confide in him, and truſt in what he ſays, it will create fear, jealouſy, and diſtruſt; deſtroy all confidence between man and man; and produce thoſe evils *now*, which he tells us muſt happen hereafter. How exceedingly kind and benevolent it is in this State Quack to perſuade the people to take his *noſtrum*, which would infallibly produce to-morrow *all* that devaſtation and ruin he deſcribes, which otherwiſe may not happen till another *century*. Believe as he deſires, that all appearances are immaterial; like BERKLEY's objects of ſenſe, *all* mere *bubbles*; that at moſt we have not more than fourteen or fifteen millions to pay three hundred, perhaps five hundred millions with, and what would be the conſequence? Nothing

Nothing leſs than that general devaſtation and ruin, which he labours ſo pathetically to deſcribe! How truly patriotic, and like a good Citizen, to precipitate, to drive the people headlong upon a meaſure, which muſt inevitably deſtroy them, and without which nothing can deſtroy them.

The happineſs and ſtrength of a people depend upon its unanimity and concord; in a mutual truſt and confidence repoſed in each other, of ſupporting, and being ſupported for the common good of all.—To poiſon the minds of the people, to eſtrange their affections from their Prince, to poſſeſs their minds with doubts and fears; and finally, to deſtroy the credit of the moſt opulent and reſpectable Corporation in the world, upon which, as he acknowledges, the whole depends, and cannot ſubſiſt without, is certainly one of the moſt atrocious crimes that ever was attempted by man. The Bank of England may be conſidered as the grand central fund which ſupplies the circulating money of the kingdom. It is like the ſea, which furniſhes the atmoſphere with moiſture, which deſcends in plenteous ſhowers to refreſh, invigorate, and fructify the earth, and having performed its office, returns again to repleniſh the ſea, by which

a due

a due equilibrium is maintained, and order, regularity, and permanency preſerved. So the Bank ſupplies the exigencies of all, according to their ſeveral demands, whether it be money for paper, or paper for money, which having performed its office, and run through its courſe of circulation, returns again to the Bank, either in paper or ſpecie, as beſt ſuits the convenience of the owner. Here a due equilibrium is likewiſe maintained, and, if its natural operations and regular circulations and returns are not diſturbed by ſome extraneous cauſe, its duration may laſt for ages. How ſhould it be otherwiſe, if men of property, the friends of Government and Great-Britain, make it their grand fund, and depoſit their treaſure there, who or what can affect its credit? If the people of property unite in the common defence of credit, can the outcry of Fanatics, or the daring inſolence of Men of no Property deſtroy it? It is every man's intereſt to ſupport the credit of the Bank, becauſe his own credit and ſecurity depend upon it. The moſt opulent in trade frequently experience the convenience of its aid, and even the Bankers themſelves, at leaſt the greater part of them, have been greatly benefited thereby. In ſhort, there is no conſiderable Tradeſman in the City but either

either mediately or immediately has made it his reſource to enable him to carry on his buſineſs. It may therefore, with great propriety, be reckoned the grand SOURCE from whence the ſtreams flow which put the commercial and mercantile wheels in motion, and give life, vigour, and permanency to the whole. What kind of Citizen then muſt he be, who inceſſantly labours, with all his might, to deſtroy the credit of that Body, which enables thouſands to maintain their credit, to ſupport and extend their trade, which gives employment and bread to millions, ſupports Government, and conſtitutes a great and flouriſhing Empire.

That the factious and rebellious may repent and return to their duty; peace be eſtabliſhed throughout *all* the Britiſh dominions; Civil Liberty, and the Conſtitutional Rights of the people flouriſh; and all unite in the meaſures which tend to promote the peace, harmony, and proſperity of theſe kingdoms, is the ſincere prayer of

GENTLEMEN,

Your moſt humble Servant,

THE AUTHOR.

CIVIL LIBERTY

ASSERTED,

AND THE

RIGHTS of the SUBJECT

DEFENDED, &c.

TO your queſtion, Sir, "How I like Dr. PRICE's Obſervations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, &c?" I anſwer, not at all. I neither like his motives for writing, nor the tendency of his doctrine. The firſt is plainly to ſupport an undue preference he has thought proper to give to the Colonies; and the latter to add ſtrength to that perverſeneſs and obſtinacy which gave birth to, and is now blazing with, all the horrors of rebellion.

I muſt acknowledge, however, his Pamphlet contains many important truths, and 'tis greatly to be lamented that they are ſo blended with falſe reaſoning as to give an air of plauſibility to doctrines, which tend to deſtroy the peace and happineſs of thoſe, whom nature, duty and intereſt ſhould firmly unite.

A liberty to examine all meaſures which reſpect us, and to bear an active part in ſuch meaſures, is not only our right, but our duty; but when that liberty is perverted to miſlead the judgment, and inflame the minds of the Community, it degenerates into licentiouſneſs, and converts a right into a crime, and the Author becomes a ſubject of puniſhment inſtead of protection.

At this ſtage of the queſtion, whether Great Britain has a right to tax her Colonies? the Doctor very rightly thought it unneceſſary to enquire upon any ground which had been trod by others, the ſubject having been perfectly exhauſted; he therefore thought proper to chooſe freſh ground, hoping to meet with more ſucceſs than any of his Predeceſſors had done, in that falſe, patriotic, inglorious field of deſtroy-

ing

ing the Rights of his Country, under the ſtale pretence of protection.

The unnatural diſpute between Great Britain and her Colonies is one of the moſt unfortunate events that could poſſibly have happened to either; the ruin of one is pretty certain, the eſcape of either doubtful. What horrors muſt at times ſeize the ſoul of every one who have had an active part in the deſtruction of their Country! Should it be aſked, who are thoſe? Without heſitation I would anſwer, *all*, who have abetted the rebellion of America; all who have countenanced them with their advice, aſſiſted them with their purſes, or in any wiſe or manner contributed to encourage them to rebel againſt the Government. From this corrupt ſource, the whole evil may truly be ſaid to originate; it was this which ſet the great wheel of rebellion in motion, and has been daily adding momentum to its force. In this unnatural conteſt, they have, indeed, ſuſtained a moſt diſtinguiſhed part, a diſtinction marked with the miſeries of their Country, with the blood of thouſands, with the deſolation of the Colonies, and by thoſe means are and will in time become equally the objects of deteſtation both of

this Country, and *that*, to the lateſt poſterity.

It required no great penetration in thoſe to diſcover, that a feeble effort to reduce the Colonies to obedience, would prove ineffectual, ſeeing they had previouſly determined to add all the weight and firmneſs to their obſtinacy, which the united approbation of a very reſpectable body both for number and influence here could give to their meaſures. The clamours of treaſon on this ſide, have blown up the flames of rebellion on that, and ſpread them through every part of the Britiſh dominions. Had it not been for thoſe inteſtine foes of their Country, all differences had been probably long ſince adjuſted, to the mutual ſatisfaction and permanent advantage of both. But there are reſtleſs ſpirits in ſome men, which view every object through a poiſoned medium, and know no reſt, unleſs they themſelves have the principal direction of the whole. Every evil is by them aſcribed to the weakneſs, the madneſs, or the more pernicious and unpardonable cauſe, the rapacity of the Miniſtry; though they themſelves, like the true Patrons of Malevolence and Diſcord, with infinitely more dexterity than integrity, have been almoſt the ſole perpe-

perpetrators of all the miſchief they have ſo diſhoneſtly laid to the charge of o-thers.

From what ſource did all this ſtrange miſchief ariſe? Why, from the diſcuſſion of a queſtion too ſimple and plain for even ignorance itſelf to miſtake, or, as one ſhould imagine, for falſhood to miſrepreſent. If truth, rectitude, equity, juſtice, and pro-portion mean any thing, the human un-derſtanding is not ſuſceptible of a clearer truth, than, that in every ſociety of men in the world, every individual perſon in it is by an indiſſoluble tie ariſing from the un-alterable nature and relation of things, bound to bear a proportionable ſhare of the expence, labour, and toil, which are neceſ-ſary to protect and ſupport the well being of the community in general, and of each individual in particular. Yet, ſelf evident I may ſay as this propoſition is, many per-ſons, the moſt reſpectable for their know-ledge, have obſtinately maintained that one part of the ſubjects of Great Britain ought of right to bear the whole, while the other is ſubject to no part whatever, or at moſt ſuch part only as they might in their gene-roſity think proper to *give*.

Repug-

Repugnant as this manifeſtly is to the common ſenſe of mankind, the Americans have been encouraged by the factious here to inſiſt upon it as their unalienable right, and they are ſtill defending it by every outrage and act of violence that ever ſtained the moſt rebellious race which ever curſed mankind.

The Doctor, as I obſerved before, has thought proper to change the ground. His arguments are pretended to be drawn from principles of nature, or that liberty which is the birthright of man. He has divided liberty into four heads, phyſical, moral, religious and civil. The three firſt he has made little uſe of in the proſecution of his argument, we ſhall therefore paſs them over with only obſerving, that his explanation of Moral Liberty is very inaccurate and exceptionable; for if the Moral Liberty of man is deſtroyed, he neceſſarily ceaſes to be an accountable being, and therefore not an object either of reward or puniſhment. Man may ſuſpend it or abuſe it, but he can no way deſtroy it without deſtroying himſelf; whilſt he exiſts, he either poſſeſſes Moral Liberty or he does not; if he does, he is a Moral Agent, if not, he cannot be accountable as ſuch.

But

But it is Civil Liberty on which the Doctor depends for the defence of his favourites on the other ſide the Atlantic. His ideas of Civil Liberty ſeem to differ greatly from the ideas of other men; indeed they are followed by conſequences few men would care to own. His Civil Liberty ſeems to differ little from Natural Liberty, a Liberty ſuggeſted by the will of an individual, accommodated to his own intereſt and inclination, rather than marked out and defined by the community for general uſe and public benefit. Compacts which the intereſt of ſociety require ſhould be held ſacred, are deemed no longer binding than they quadrate with the convenience or inclination of the parties. 'Tis ſaid a man cannot bind himſelf, much leſs his poſterity, and that every man is a ſlave who is not governed by laws of his own making. All this may be true or falſe as circumſtances may vary.

Natural Liberty and Civil Liberty are as different as any thing can be rendered by different circumſtances. In a ſtate of nature where property is not ſpecifically annexed to perſonalty, where every one can feaſt on the bounties of nature, can gather the fruits of this or that tree, and drink at this or any other ſpring he chuſes, and knows no bounds

but

but thoſe eſtabliſhed by nature, may be ſaid to enjoy Natural Liberty. But Civil Liberty voluntarily gives up the natural right to boundleſs range, to enjoy in ſecurity and peace, the bleſſings of property annexed to individuals, and protected by general conſent and united endeavours. By this means the liberty of man becomes leſs extenſive, but more ſecure, and productive of eaſe and happineſs.

Natural Liberty is uniform, and admits of no variation. In a ſtate of nature every one extends his enjoyment as far as his will and his powers enable him; but Civil Liberty can extend no further than the laws of the ſociety permit; here the will and power of individuals are limitted by the general law, and no man thinks himſelf a ſlave becauſe he cannot tranſgreſs unpuniſhed; for the ſame law that lays a reſtraint upon him, and prevents his abuſing others, protects him and his property, and prevents them from abuſing him, which is the perfection of Human Liberty.

In the ſeveral governments of mankind amazing revolutions have taken place in the different ages and countries of the world. Little can be derived from the ſtudy of them,

them, but a melancholy picture of Human Nature, when under the government of power conducted by paſſions which are deaf to the leſſons of reaſon and humanity. It would be to little purpoſe therefore, in this enquiry, to ſeek for countenance either from the example or authority of others; we will not therefore enquire what has been done, or what ſome think ſhould be done; but what, from the nature of things, and the conſtitution of man, may be done conſiſtently with the liberty and happineſs of mankind, which is the end and purpoſe of government.

In the firſt ages of the world it ſeems moſt probable that mankind enjoyed all things in common, and lived upon terms of equality. Their ſufferings and enjoyments were nearly the ſame, unleſs where a difference might ariſe from a more or leſs robuſt and vigorous conſtitution; when this general copartnercy gave place to a ſpecial allotment of property, or how it was proportioned and aſcertained, I believe we are much at a loſs to know; but it ſeems no very difficult taſk to ſuppoſe a number of men in a ſtate of Natural Liberty, and trace their progreſſion from that ſtate to a ſtate of government in which Civil Liberty is main-

tained to a conſiderable degree of perfection. But as compact is ſo little regarded, and ſo great ſtreſs laid on inherent or natural rights, it may be worth while to dwell a little upon that ſtate, beginning with man in his infancy.

Man in his infancy is a very incapable helpleſs creature, and, like all other animals, depends upon the breaſt of his mother for ſupport, but with this remarkable difference, that theſe begin to pick up ſomething towards their maintenance in as few days, as he does or can in ſo many years. Providence has been graciouſly pleaſed to impreſs a ſtrong and laſting affection in the mind of the parent to nouriſh, protect, and ſuſtain its young, till it can provide for itſelf; otherwiſe not one in a million could arrive at maturity. His ſupport, therefore, in his infancy, depends entirely upon the affection of his parents; this however continues to ſupport him but a few years; he is then, for the moſt part, left to thoſe inherent rights and powers beſtowed upon him by Nature, upon which *all* is made to depend. Now what are thoſe rights of Nature? Why every one has the unbounded liberty of ranging the wild uncultivated garden of the world, to collect with labour,

toil,

toil, and indefatigable induſtry, whatever bountiful Nature has provided for his ſupport, and placed within his reach. His right therefore extends as far as his legs can carry him, and his hands can reach to bring to his mouth what he deſires. Here end the natural rights and inherent powers of man. Is not this natural liberty a glorious condition, think ye, when compared to the abject ſlavery of man in every civilized ſtate whoſe government is ſhort of abſolute perfection?

The natural rights of man, we have ſeen, extend to the fruits of his own labour and induſtry, but no further; to theſe he has an undoubted right, but no ſecurity for the enjoyment of that right further than his own power extends to protect it; the proviſion he can then make for his ſubſiſtence can extend only from hand to mouth; ſhould he attempt any thing further, the firſt perſon he meets, who is ſtronger than himſelf, may deprive him of the whole fruits of his labour. Now compare this with the miſerable ſtate of ſlavery, which Dr. PRICE deſcribes as being worſe than death. There's a poor Cobler has a ſtall about fifty yards off, who has a daughter cloathed and kept at ſchool by the pariſh,

a boy in the Blue-coat-hoſpital, who is not the leaſt expence to him. This poor man is as merry as a lark, ſmokes his pipe, and drinks his pint of porter in an evening, and his pot, perhaps three pints, on Sundays. He is in all reſpects at leaſt as happy as my very good Lord the Earl of Shelburne; yet, poor man, he has no vote, he has no Repreſentative in Parliament; therefore, ſays our philoſophic Doctor, he is a wretch, he is a ſlave, and doomed to drag the ignominious chain which tyranny is forging for him. Alas! what is become of that noble ſpirit of freedom that animated our forefathers, and made them ſhed their deareſt blood in the cauſe of Liberty! Thus our poor Cobler is dubbed a *poltron*, becauſe he has not ſpirit enough to join a rebellious mob, at the call of the Doctor, and ſtand the chance of making his exit at Tyburn. Let any one, but a F. R. S. compare the condition of this poor ſlave of a Cobler, who eats and drinks well, lies dry and warm, ſleeps ſound and ſecure, a ſtranger to want and care; with that happy Prince of Liberty, the Green Man of the Wood, who is a ſtranger to every comfort of life, which to him is ſupportable only becauſe he has no idea of any thing ſuperior to the condition of him who feaſts upon carrion;

who,

who, were he not a ſtranger to the comparative wretchedneſs of his condition, would die of envy and deſpair. I ſay, let any unprejudiced man compare the wretched ſlave of a Citizen, with this ſon of native Liberty, and tell me which is the happieſt man?

Having premiſed thus much, I will now pay a particular attention to the Doctor's reaſoning on the ſubject, beginning with his 2d Section: *Of Civil Liberty, and the Principles of Government.*

That the true object of Government is the happineſs of the people, and that every Government is more or leſs perfect, as it operates to that moſt valuable purpoſe, are truths too evident to be denied. The only true principles of Government then, are thoſe which protect, ſecure, and render the people happy. But how far a free Government, which makes this its whole object, is the creature of the people, originates with them, and is conducted under their direction, are queſtions which require very careful diſcuſſions.

By the people, in thoſe Obſervations, we are every where to underſtand the whole people, that is to ſay, every individual. For

it

it ſeems "in every free ſtate every man is his own Legiſlator." If he be not, the ſtate is not free, and every man who is not his own Legiſlator is a ſlave. This is the wonderful doctrine upon which the Doctor has raiſed his ſuperſtructure of Civil Liberty. Principles, I will venture to ſay, as repugnant to Civil Liberty, as to the reaſon and common ſenſe of mankind. As deſtructive of the true object and end of government, as anarchy and confuſion are to peace and good order. In the infancy of a *State* laws may be eſtabliſhed by COMMON CONSENT, becauſe in ſuch a State every thing may be held common, and while a State is ſo circumſtanced every man's will is his law, and his right equal to any other of the community. But as ſoon as ſuch common right, by common conſent, ſhall be divided into particular portions, and be appropriated to each member by mutual conſent and compact, a man in ſuch a State is no longer his own Legiſlator, his will or deſire is no longer his rule of action, he muſt now ſubmit to the laws of the ſociety, or become obnoxious to thoſe he has violated, and perhaps forfeit his property, whatever it may conſiſt of, together with the right he originally had in the Legiſlature. From that ſad æra he ceaſes to be a man of property, to have any voice, influ-

influence, or direction, in making or altering the laws, tho' his duty of ſubmitting to them in all things, remains equally cogent as before. Now what is ſuch a man to do for a ſubſiſtence? Why, having nothing to depend upon but his faculties of body and mind, he muſt exerciſe one or the other, or both for that purpoſe. Muſt we henceforward deem ſuch a man a *ſlave?* Becauſe he has no voice, no ſhare in the Legiſlature, has he loſt his liberty as a man? By no means; if the State to which he belongs be a State of Civil Liberty, he is as much a free man as before, tho' he has loſt his right as a Legiſlator. He may, and moſt probably muſt become a ſervant, but with no ſort of propriety can he be called a ſlave.

Further, it is not true that, "in every free State every man is his own Legiſlator." Except by a ſtrange abuſe of language, by a *free State* be meant a State of Nature, in which indeed every man may be ſaid to be his own Legiſlator, if the following his own will can be properly called ſo, which, however, is more properly being lawleſs. But taking a free State in its uſual acceptation, then I ſay, there is no free State in which a man is, or can be his own Legiſlator. This will readily appear, by fixing the idea

of

of COMMON CONSENT, which was never underſtood to include the conſent of every individual. Were that neceſſary, there would be few human laws indeed. By common conſent, then, is meant, the conſent of a *clear* and *certain* majority of the members in whom the right of conſtituting laws is veſted. Sometimes it happens that this is barely diſtinguiſhable, the numbers being nearly equal, conſequently nearly one half muſt ſubmit to laws which are not only not of their own making, but directly repugnant to their will and conſent, and often perhaps not only injurious to themſelves, but alſo greatly ſo to the public.

In what ſenſe then is it to be underſtood, that in every free State every man is his own Legiſlator, ſeeing the will of every man is liable to be counteracted and over-ruled, and obliged to ſubmit to the will of others? It may be ſaid, the freedom of ſuch a man conſiſts in the right he has of aſſiſting at the making of all laws that reſpect him or the community, tho' a majority in many caſes may be againſt him, and determine contrary to his will. But this is a very falſe idea of liberty; 'tis ſubſtituting a right to aſſiſt in making laws, in the ſtead of virtuous laws which ſecure liberty. In the former caſe, a man

man may have a right, and may exerciſe that right, and yet be a ſlave; in the latter he may enjoy perfect freedom, without having the leaſt right to aſſiſt in the framing the laws, by which he is governed, or being at all conſulted therein. The *ſophiſtry* of this reaſoning of the Doctor's, conſiſts in aſcribing that to the *means* which entirely belongs to the *thing* which is to be attained by ſuch or ſome other means. For Freedom or Civil Liberty does not at all conſiſt in every individual exerciſing a right in framing the laws, by which ſuch individuals are to be governed; but in the power of doing whatever the laws permit, conformably to rules of equity and juſtice, which operate indiſcriminately on all orders and degrees of men, and by which, the meaneſt individual is protected from the inſults and oppreſſions of the great. He who is protected in the peaceable enjoyment of his rights is a Freeman, and enjoys Civil Liberty, tho' he has no ſort of right in framing the laws, by which he is governed; while, on the other hand, he who is moleſted and interrupted in the free uſe and enjoyment of his rights, is ſo far a ſlave, tho' he has a right to aſſiſt, and actually doth aſſiſt at every law that paſſes. From hence it is evident, that, the Doctor's idea of Liberty is a falſe idea, a mere nominal

Liberty which is compatible with the moſt arrant ſlavery: Being indulged in certain formalities, which is falſely denominated Freedom, at the ſame time deprived of the free enjoyment of his own real rights, which conſtitutes the true eſſence of Freedom.

But his idea of Civil Liberty being nominal, is very far from being the worſt part of the buſineſs; it is not only falſe but inimical, and productive of principles deſtructive of Liberty, and incompatible with that Freedom which is the object of every Civil State. We have already ſeen how a Member of a free State may loſe his property and his right, to aſſiſt either in the making or the execution of the Laws by which he is to be governed: But there are many other ways by which men may become Subjects of a free State, and be equally protected in the free uſe and enjoyment of every thing that appertaineth to them, as perfectly as the firſt man in the State, though they have not the leaſt right or concern in the buſineſs of Legiſlation, and conſequently are as free, if freedom conſiſts in the poſſeſſion of the real bleſſings denoted by the name, and not in the non-productive idea of a formal act. It muſt be obvious to every one who has at all exerciſed his thoughts on the buſineſs

buſineſs of Government, that every man's power and influence in a State is, *ceteris paribus*, in proportion to the amount of his property; and the propriety of the meaſure is founded in the reaſon and the nature of things. From whence it clearly follows, that he that has no property has no power, and conſequently no right to the exerciſe of any power reſpecting property, or any thing relative thereto. Now the Laws of every Civil State in the world chiefly relate to property, and therefore men of property are thoſe whoſe eſpecial duty, as well as intereſt it is to take care of the equity, impartiality, and juſtice of the Laws; that every one be equally protected in the quiet poſſeſſion and enjoyment of all which of right belongs unto him. But thoſe who poſſeſs no property, can have no right nor pretence to concern themſelves therewith. In the nature and reaſon of things, 'tis clearly impoſſible that he that has no property of his own, ſhould have a right to aſſiſt in the making of laws, concerning the diſpoſal of the property of other people; there never was a more abſurd, nor a more dangerous tenet adopted by the moſt avowed and the moſt inveterate Enemy of *Civil Liberty*; and yet this is the doctrine ſo much inſiſted on by the

Doctor: The doctrine which is made the ſubſtratum of that treaſonable ſyſtem upon which the ignominious ſuperſtructure of AMERICAN REBELLION has been raiſed and is ſupported.

But I have ſaid the Doctor's idea of Civil Liberty is ſo far from being a true idea, that it is abſolutely incompatible with, and deſtructive of, Civil Liberty. I believe it will be readily granted, that by far the greater part of the people in all civilized States are men of no real property, but live, as it were, from hand to mouth by their labour, or by means not only far leſs honourable, but even dangerous and injurious to ſociety. In Great Britain, a State which, I hope, and I believe, is very far from being the moſt neceſſitous, I think the men of real property bear but a ſmall proportion to thoſe that have none; ſhould the latter have the ſame power in the Legiſlature as the former, (which it ſeems the Doctor maintains is neceſſary to conſtitute Freedom, and protect the State from Slavery,) I ſay, then, property would become the moſt precarious and inſecure thing in the world; for whether the men of no property exerciſed their ſuppoſed rights *individually* and *perſonally*, or by

Subſtitutes

Subſtitutes or *Repreſentatives*, they, upon this plan, would have a power to enact Laws, reſpecting the diſpoſal of other men's property, in which they had no right, equal to the owners themſelves, who poſſeſſed the ſole right of ſuch diſpoſal; and being a greater majority by far, would ſoon become the legal proprietors of other men's property, at leaſt ſo much thereof, as they in their gracious moderation might deſire. Thus the bleſſings of Civil Liberty would be deſtroyed by what is moſt ſophiſtically defined to be Civil Liberty: A meaſure not more dreadful in its immediate effects, than in its ſubſequent operations: For every encouragement to men to be induſtrious, to be careful, temperate, and frugal, the acquiſition of property being the reward of their own care and pains, and at the ſame time the ſupport and glory of the State, would at once be done away, and a race of induſtrious men be converted into a clan of *banditti*.

Were it neceſſary to the eſtabliſhment of this truth to quote ſimilar facts, I need only refer the candid Reader to the principles, I ſhould rather ſay caprice, of the populace, wherever they have a voice in any Election. Perhaps thoſe who are ever

ſo

ſo little acquainted with what paſſes in the Metropolis, will readily recollect, that any man, the moſt abandoned, the moſt unprincipled, the daring blaſphemer of his Maker, and the oſtenſible enemy of all that is honeſt, virtuous and good; if he has but the art and addreſs to unite his name to *Liberty*, thouſands, miſtaking his profeſſions for his principles, become furious Zealots in his Cauſe, and lend him every aid in their power to ſtrangle the Genius of Britain, under whoſe protection Liberty has hitherto flouriſhed. Many, indeed, are actuated by principles ſimilar to his own. Men of deſperate fortunes, corrupt morals, diſſolute lives, too much inured to vicious courſes to ſupport their expences by the honeſt means of induſtrious employment, become furious Coadjutors in promoting general confuſion to the deſtruction of Liberty, the cauſe they profeſs, to eſtabliſh the infernal Goddeſs Licentiouſneſs they devoutly adore in its ſtead, hoping in the hurly-burly of univerſal conſternation to mend their fortunes in the ſcramble. This obſervation is ſo juſt, that ſome would venture to lay great odds, that from a true hiſtory of a man's life they would name the object of his ſuffrage, ſo that to be

be a —ite and a knave ſeems to denote the ſame thing.

If among ſo ſmall a number as ſeven or eight thouſand, and theſe particularly qualified to vote for Officers of the City, a number ſufficient to ſupport men of the moſt abandoned and corrupt principles, againſt thoſe whoſe conduct have ever been virtuous and reſpectable, are to be found, what is to be expected from perhaps ten times that number, all in penurious ſtations, ready to embrace every meaſure that promiſes to alleviate their wants, though it is founded in the moſt execrable cruelty and injuſtice? Nothing leſs than an entire ſubverſion of all Government, uniſal anarchy and plunder; and thus would it be, and it is impoſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe, if every man was his own Legiſlator. If it is neceſſary to add any authority from others, in ſupport of theſe obſervations, I need only quote the Doctor's own remark, in a note in p. 10. of his Book, where he obſerves, that among the cauſes which have a tendency to deſtroy the Liberty of this Country, that moſt of the Electors are of the meaneſt and pooreſt of the people; now is it poſſible for him to believe that the increaſing the number in the

the proportion of five, perhaps more, to one, could be the means of preſerving it; if in the firſt caſe, the number of ſuch Electors is too great to conſiſt with the ſafety of the State, will increaſing that number five-fold, render it more ſafe? Repugnant as this is to common ſenſe, it is the clear unavoidable conſequence of the Doctor's reaſoning.

Whatever ſchemes of Government theoretical men may plan, there is no ſuch thing in practice as abſolute perfection; but if there was, no device upon earth could operate more efficaciouſly in its ſubverſion than the Doctor's principles, of every man being his own Legiſlator, taking the propoſition in the moſt favourable ſenſe for the Doctor. It is evident, that far the greater part of the people are deſtitute of property, and have nothing to depend upon for the ſupport of themſelves and families but their labour; their poſterity for the moſt part inherit the ſame indigent ſtate; now it ſeems if every ſuch individual perſon in a State has not a voice in the choice of the Repreſentatives of the People, the State is not a free State, and its Civil Liberty is no more than a name. I wiſh the Doctor had been kind enough to have given us a reaſon for this very extraordinary doctrine. Is it the voice

of

of Nature, Equity, or Reaſon, that a man who has no property, ſhall have the ſame power to diſpoſe of another man's as the owner; and if he has not, that the ſaid owner thereby becomes a ſlave? No, but it is the voice of Dr. PRICE. Let Dr. PRICE ſtand forth then, and explain or acknowledge the abſurdity of ſo palpable a contradiction.

" All *taxes* are free gifts for public ſervices." The Writers on this ſide the queſtion ſeem mighty fond of this propoſition. The Doctor aſſerts it, I would, therefore, be glad to know from him, if they are the free gifts of the perſons who pay them? If ſo, there are few men in this kingdom who have not more underſtanding in this buſineſs than him; every one knows that there is not one perſon in ten that would pay a ſhilling for that purpoſe, if they knew any poſſible method to avoid it; therefore, in this ſenſe, the aſſertion is not true. But it may be ſaid, they are the gifts of the Delegates of the People, who repreſent them. But this is no more true than the former, for it cannot be ſaid with any propriety that one man, or any number of men, can *give* away the property of others, in which they have no right. The truth is,

it is not a gift, but more properly a debt; Money levied on the people to defray the neceſſary expences of Government, which chiefly conſiſts in protecting the people's lives and properties, is therefore no more a gift than the money I pay a man for watching my grounds and premiſes, is a gift, which I am ſure no man would acknowledge to be ſo.

In p. 11, it is ſaid, "Liberty is more or leſs complete and perfect, as the people have more or leſs of a ſhare in Government," &c. I anſwer, this is more or leſs true or falſe, according to the Author's meaning by the word people. If by people we are to underſtand the whole people, comprehending every degree of them, then I apprehend it has been clearly ſhewn, that Liberty is imperfect, in proportion as their controuling power is great; and if it be abſolute, then Liberty has no exiſtence. But if by the people we are to underſtand thoſe who elect the Repreſentatives of the people, then I agree their prudence, integrity and power cannot be too great, and that true political Liberty would be perfect in proportion as they exerciſed thoſe qualifications with ability and honeſty. I will likewiſe add, that the more equally a people are repreſented,

ſented, the nearer their Liberty will approach to perfection.

But it may be neceſſary to enquire, what is meant by *equal Repreſentation?* I anſwer, not a Repreſentation in which every individual has an equal choice, as the Doctor maintains; for that is a Repreſentation neither founded in equity, proportion, or rectitude; but in a mode that is ſubverſive and deſtructive of each. The beauty, truth, ſtrength and duration of a political ſyſtem, like a phyſical ſyſtem, conſiſts in the juſt ſymmetry and true proportion of its parts. If theſe are not attended to, 'tis in vain to look for regularity, order, and ſtability, in its effects. A Government founded on the Doctor's principles, would be like erecting a ſtupendous fabric on quickſands, which are equally deſtitute of ſolidity and coherence. The conſtituent parts of his Repreſentation have no common principle to unite them; inſtead of mutual attraction and coheſion, they are actuated by principles of repulſion and diſunion, every one eagerly purſuing his own will, in oppoſition to the will of all the reſt, agreeably to his favourite doctrine, "that every man is his own Legiſlator."

The perfection of Civil Liberty, and the happineſs of Society, depend entirely upon the due harmonizing and fitly adapting and apportioning its component parts. Every Member ſhould be eſtimated according to its weight and power. Men of the greateſt ſubſtance and moſt ample fortunes ſhould be inveſted with proportionable powers in ſuperintending the affairs of the State. They would carefully attend to the preſervation of the whole, for the ſake of the large ſhare they hold in the concern; and in the choice of Repreſentatives, the ſame proportion of power ſhould obtain. They may be fitly compared to the Maſter of a Ship, who, if not concerned for the ſafety of his Paſſengers and the goods of the Merchant, would exert his utmoſt abilities to preſerve his veſſel and his life, and, in effecting the latter, is included the ſafety of the former. But thoſe who would truſt the large Veſſel of the State to Navigators who have no property in her, may ſoon expect to ſee themſelves run a-ground on the firſt convenient ſands, that thoſe who have the direction of the voyage may make their fortunes out of the wreck. If the power of Electors, in the choice of Repreſentatives, was proportioned to the intereſt they have in the fair and honeſt diſcharge of their duty, probably we ſhould ſoon have

Repre-

Repreſentatives of a very different complexion. The propriety and rectitude of the meaſure is evinced from its ſimilarity to another in the State, which has obtained univerſally, I mean that of every man's being taxed, and bearing a ſhare of the burthen neceſſary to the ſupport of Government, in proportion to his poſſeſſions. That this is equitable, I believe no one will venture to deny. Why, then, is it not equally ſo, that every one ſhould have a proportional ſhare in the choice of thoſe who are to have the diſpoſal of his property? The people then would no longer be bubbled by the name of a falſe Patriot being annexed to Liberty, ſeeing nothing more is intended by the cloſe connection, than to ſtrangle it with the greater certainty. Was the Devil himſelf to be a Candidate for the firſt Office in the City, upon whoſe integrity the welfare of all mankind both here and hereafter depended, (if any ſuch Office there was,) could he perſuade the Electors he would ſurely fall the price of porter a halfpenny a pot, he would certainly be the ſucceſsful Candidate, unleſs another more artful than himſelf could poſſeſs them with a belief that he would fall it a penny. Yet theſe are the mighty men to whom the Doctor has given the wonderful title of being the omnipotent

Defenders

Defenders of Liberty, and the Saviors of their Country.

Again, he that is guided by his own will, with a competency of power, is too *free* for any one elſe to be *free*. If his will be not accompanied with power ſufficient to execute what he will, then he cannot be guided by his own will, therefore cannot be *free*, and if his will be accompanied with ſuch power, then no one elſe can be free, becauſe they muſt be guided by his will who is armed with power to execute it, and not their own, who have not that power. If it be ſaid Freedom conſiſts in every one being poſſeſſed with power to follow the guidance of his own will, this we have already ſhewn to be falſe, abſurd and impoſſible. This is true of no ſtate, but a State of Nature, and in that but in a very narrow and limited degree. It is ſo far from "being particularly applicable to political Liberty," that it is deſtructive of it, directly repugnant to it, and impoſſible to exiſt where every one is guided by his own will.

True political Liberty conſiſts in the protection, ſafety, and defence of every one in the peaceable enjoyment of his own rights, guarantee'd and ſecured to him by the Laws,

to

to which a full and exact obedience and ſubmiſſion is due, and who in all things is directed and guided thereby. Not in being guided by his own will, contrary to, and in contempt of the laws, which is a doctrine, if it means any thing, that leads to treaſon and rebellion, in the practice of which a man is to be guided by his will, without moleſtation, otherwiſe he becomes a *ſlave*. This is the ſtrange doctrine and practice of modern patriotiſm, calculated to propagate and encourage the preſent reigning taſte of rebellion in America, and here of every treaſonable encouragement thereto.

The will of thoſe who conſtitute a State, is the will of ſuch State, and the State that is guided by ſuch will is *free*. Of ſuch Liberty it is impoſſible that there ſhould be an exceſs, that is, it is impoſſible it ſhould be too perfect. Government is (certainly) an inſtitution for the benefit of the people governed, that is for the whole people; but the whole of the people have not a right to model Government as they pleaſe, becauſe, as we have ſhewn, the greater part of them have no right to interfere in matters of Government at all. But if by the people be meant, all thoſe who are eſſentially neceſſary to conſtitute the State, and who repreſent

the whole people, then the propoſition is true. And to ſay that there ought to be a power in the State, ſuperior to the power of the State, is to talk nonſenſe; for the State which has a right to model itſelf, muſt alſo have the power neceſſary to govern itſelf, or to ſay it has a right to model itſelf, is alſo nugatory and nonſenſe. " A free State makes all its Members free, by excluding licentiouſneſs, and guarding their perſons and property and good name againſt inſult. It is the end of all juſt Government, at the ſame time that it ſecures the Liberty of the Public againſt *foreign* injury, to ſecure the Liberty of the Individual againſt *private* injury." Let it be eſpecially noted, that it is the *State* that makes its Members free, and ſecures both the Public and the Individual from injury; not the will of the Individual, nor of the people, exerciſed otherwiſe than according to the conſtitutional mode of the State, can give the leaſt protection either to one or the other, tho' it may injure and deſtroy both. " It is not juſt to ſay, that it belongs to the nature of Government to entrench on private Liberty." But it is juſt to ſay, that it is eſſentially neceſſary to Government, that Individuals ſhould give up all right of being guided by their own wills, in perfect ſubmiſſion to the guidance of the

will

will of the State of which they are Members; otherwiſe private Liberty has a right to encroach both on private and public Liberty.

The true end of Government is to protect the people from being injured, either by deſpotiſm or licentiouſneſs; this is to be effected only by equal laws of the State, which operate in defence of all indiſcriminately. The will of individuals muſt all ſubmit hereto. This undoubtedly is our own conſtitution; that it is not much abuſed I will not ſay, but it is much to be feared thoſe who exclaim the loudeſt are far from being the moſt innocent among the foes of Liberty.

Whether Deſpotiſm or Licentiouſneſs is moſt unfriendly to Liberty, I hope is bootleſs to enquire, eſpecially with a view to oppoſe a mere phantom of the former, with all the ſubſtantial real horrors of the latter. But ſome, miſtaking the reſtleſs heat of their own imaginations for a conflagration of the State, feel a pleaſing animation which they fancy favourable to the human mind, which puts it upon exerting all its powers, hoping for ſhelter in the boundleſs tumult of a *licentious mob.*

It ſeems, "Great ſtreſs has been laid, but moſt unreaſonably, on that OMNIPOTENCE, which, it has been ſaid, muſt belong to every Government as ſuch." But why moſt unreaſonably? A Government not inveſted with power ſufficient to coerce its ſubjects obedience to its laws, would very improperly be deemed a Government, and if its power was ſufficient for that purpoſe, it would, in reſpect to ſuch Government, be omnipotent; this is the ſenſe in which that word has been uſed, and with good reaſon, as I conceive; for "let Government be a TRUST, and all its powers a DELEGATION for gaining particular ends," as much as you pleaſe, if ſuch Government is not inveſted with adequate powers to execute ſuch Truſt, the Truſt was delegated in vain, and proves the inſufficiency of the delegators, as well as the delegated. "This *Truſt* may be miſapplied and abuſed. It may be employed to defeat the very ends for which it was inſtituted; and to ſubvert the very rights which it ought to protect;" I will add, it may ſubject thoſe who have ſo miſapplied and abuſed it to the fate of traitors; they may ſuffer as men who have impiouſly betrayed their country, but Government cannot, through them, loſe its right. Who then ſhall deprive the State of its right to govern? Not Dr. PRICE, at the head of an infa-

infatuated *mob*, who, having no right to conſtitute, has no right to diſſolve. No, nor the King, Lords, nor Commons, nor their Conſtituents, but the State only, which is ſelf created, ſelf exiſtent, and indiſſoluble by any power on earth, its own inherent conſtitutional power excepted. Omnipotence can, with truth, in no ſenſe be aſcribed to the people, if conſidered as unconnected with the State; they then revert to the ſtate of Nature; their Civil Liberty no longer exiſts; the men of property become a prey to thoſe who have none, and the omnipotence of the PEOPLE, in this ſenſe of the word, is like the omnipotence of a boiſterous ſea, which overwhelms all in one general deſtruction.

I hope the people of this kingdom will ever know and value their intereſt better, than to ſuffer their minds to be inflamed and poiſoned by the intemperate zeal of State-bigots, and Republican-fanatics. To defend their civil liberties with temperate firmneſs, and manly fortitude, become them as men zealouſly tenacious of their freedom; but to be ſeduced by the atrocious faction of diſappointed ambition, and hungry expectation, to join in ſchemes of treaſon and rebellion, to ſubvert our happy con-

ſtitution, is ſuperlative madneſs and folly. Men may fooliſhly dream there is much glory in wading thro' blood to the ſtandard of anarchy, and the licentious miſrule of a mob animated by incendiaries; but ſurely there is no merit in deſerving a halter, nor any cruelty in the uſe of it, when the ſafety, peace, and happineſs of the people require it.

It muſt be confeſſed (the truth is too evident to be denied) that "the terror of the ſtanding army, the danger of the public funds, and the all corrupting influence of the treaſury, are evils of the firſt magnitude in a free State, which threaten, and too ſoon, perhaps very ſoon, may accompliſh our ruin. But from whence did theſe dreadful evils originate, and by what means have they attained their enormous ſize? Why, by the very prepoſterous meaſures that are now purſuing. Self-preſervation is a principle impreſſed univerſally on all animal being. Every one's caution and ſolicitude for ſafety increaſes in proportion as he is alarmed with the rumours of diſcontent and the terrors of danger; this neceſſarily makes him caſt about for ſafety and protection, makes him add to the height and thickneſs of his walls, and ſtrengthen every fence about him. This is the ſtate of every Prince whoſe Government

vernment is disturbed by the violence and opposition of faction, and that safety and protection, which is his right, from the duty and loyalty of his subjects, he is obliged to purchase at an immense expence, and profusion of treasure. That this is the case few will venture to deny, as every man is a Courtier, or a Patriot, as a place or a pension can be found to please or not please him. Had a Prince a fund sufficient to supply the vast demands of the avarice, ambition, and profusion of all his people, he might disband his troops, and repose himself under a hedge with as much security as the meanest peasant. The evils so loudly execrated by the ungrateful patriotic band, each of them have had a hand in their creation; they now groan under a burthen they have laid on the shoulders of themselves, (and others who have a right to more compassion,) and curse the measures that they themselves have rendered necessary. But what adds amazingly to the infatuation, they are now incurring an enormous expence to the nation, by spiriting up and fomenting a most unnatural rebellion. Our dispute with America will probably add millions to the public burthen, besides entailing a dreadful curse on both countries which perhaps will never be done away. Who are we to deem

the

the authors of theſe evils? Surely all thoſe who have ſpirited them up to rebel againſt their lawful Sovereign.

We are now come to the Doctor's third Section, of the Authority of one country over another.

What may be inferred from the nature and principles of Civil Liberty, as he has been pleaſed to explain them, is, as I conceive, nothing to the purpoſe. For Civil Liberty, by his explanation, is the Liberty of every one being guided by his own will, which, as hath been abundantly ſhewn, is the Liberty of Nature, a Liberty that is incompatible with Civil Liberty,; therefore every inference drawn from it is a falſe inference. There is a vein of ſophiſtry which runs through the whole of the Doctor's Book, which originates from this principle, that there are certain rights of Human Nature which are unalienable; which, how true ſoever in itſelf, when applied to compacts between Governments and Subjects, and between one man and another, in the manner the Doctor explains, is not only falſe, but of the moſt dangerous tendency. The merits of this diſpute, on the Doctor's principles, depend upon this ſingle queſtion: Whether

there

there are inherent rights in Human Nature, ſo connected with the will, that ſuch rights cannot be alienated, or given up in ſubmiſſion to the will of a civil Society: That is aſking, in other words, whether one in a ſtate of nature has not a right to depart from it to join with a civil ſtate, to relinquiſh the guidance of one's ſelf by one's own will, to be guided by the law of a civil ſtate by which one expects to be benefited. Here the practice of every part of the civilized world anſwers in the affirmative.

Had the Doctor's enquiry been conducted with as much candour as artifice, his concluſions would have been very different. What has one community to do with the property or legiſlation of another community, (he might as well have ſaid) to which it has no relation or connection, (or, if you will) is not ſo much as known. For it does not appear, from any thing he has ſaid, that the two communities his inference relates to, has any knowledge of each other, and therefore it cannot appear that there is any poſſible ground for one to have any right over the other. "But a country that is ſubject to the legiſlature of another country, in which it has no voices, and over which it has no controul," may be ſaid to be governed by its

its own will, as far as the civil compact ſubſiſting between the two countries permits, which is as far as the members of any civil ſtate are free, and therefore ſuch a country is not in a ſtate of ſlavery. But it may be ſaid the Doctor denies that there is any ſuch compact between the two countries, but if there is, that it is not binding. I am ſorry for it, he reaſons then like a certain great Northern Prince, who conſtantly explains his right by his power. Of what uſe ſoever this may be in the Politics of Princes, it certainly is deſtructive of the mutual bleſſings and ſecurity derived from civil ſociety. If the Doctor's idea of Liberty be juſt, there is no ſuch thing as Liberty, unleſs that of an abſolute Prince be ſo, whoſe will is his law. The ſupreme Legiſlature of a free Government is no more its own Governor, no more guided by its own will, than the meaneſt perſon in it. It muſt ſubmit its own will, and conform itſelf to the will of the State, as all men in a civil State muſt do. But becauſe every man's will in ſuch a ſtate is limitted by the law, is every man in ſuch a State a ſlave? Slavery does not conſiſt in being reſtrained from doing wrong, but in being obliged againſt our will to endure it. One may therefore be bound in a thouſand obligations, but whilſt he is ſecured in the

peace-

peaceable enjoyment of his rights, he cannot be a *ſlave*.

A State of Slavery, as deſcribed by the Doctor, being merely ideal, his concluſions drawn therefrom are ſo too, and deſerve no further notice. It muſt, however, be remarked, " that if the Government of one country by another, to whom its allegiance is legally due, can only be ſupported by a military force, and, without ſuch a ſupport, muſt be deſtitute of all weight and efficiency," it ſerves to prove that they are loſt to every tie of equity, juſtice, and rectitude; and, like the Prince above mentioned, explain their ſentiments of right by the extent of their power, and, like their advocate, the obligations of compact, by the advantages it produces, making it no longer binding than it is convenient and uſeful.

It is aſſerted, " that there are cauſes by which one State may acquire a *rightful* authority over, and intereſt in another, though not conſolidated by what is called an *adequate* repreſentation." Not by conqueſt, nor obligations conferred, it is acknowledged. The firſt gives no better title than a robber poſſeſſes, and the latter has no tie but gratitude. But compact is a ſacred tie,

founded in truth and equity, and its obligation can never be diſſolved but by the mutual conſent of the parties. There are many ways by which one country may gain a rightful authority and intereſt in another, and by which the latter may be a gainer, and the former a loſer, eſpecially if it be poſſible to conceive any thing ſo manifeſtly unjuſt to be right, as for the latter to be bound by compact no longer than it quadrates with their intereſt, or rather their inclination. Suppoſe an opulent country, unſkilled in the art of war, ſhould be overrun by a more powerful neighbour, tempted thereto by the proſpect of gain, ſhould apply for ſuccour to one ſtill more powerful, and in order to ſave a part of his country, and preſerve his people from being murdered or entirely baniſhed, and their eſtates for ever loſt, ſhould agree with his new ally to pay him and his ſucceſſors for ever, a tenth of the clear yearly income of his revenue, or in lieu thereof, become ſubject to the laws of his own State, and ſuch regulations reſpecting trade, and levying taxes, as to his legiſlature ſhould think fit and reaſonable, upon condition that he ſaved his country from the ravages of the enemy, and to continue as long as he ſo continued to defend and protect his country, his ſubjects, and

their eſtates. This great work being fully performed, and peace reſtored and eſtabliſhed throughout the country, could ſuch State, conſiſtently with principles of equity or juſtice, refuſe to make good the conditions of the compact, in its fulleſt latitude? Will any one dare to ſay ſuch a compact is not founded in juſtice, and in ſuch caſes *compacts or ceſſions are* not binding? Would "this be ſuch a ceſſion, as would be inconſiſtent with the rights of human nature, would either not bind at all, or bind only the individuals who made it?" I will venture to ſay it would bind not only the individuals who made it, but all ſucceeding generations who might inherit from them. If truth, equity, and juſtice mean any thing permanent and immutable, any thing which relate to the actions of mankind in reſpect of each other, then a ceſſion made by one State for a valuable conſideration received from another, is a good and valid ceſſion, and cannot be violated without a manifeſt breach of that faith which is the great bond of ſecurity between all contracting parties, whether they are individuals or public bodies. This is not a bleſſing given up by one generation to the prejudice of another, but a part of the property of the preſent generation given up to preſerve the peaceable en-

joyment of the remainder, for the benefit of themſelves and all future generations, which neither the preſent nor any future generation could rightfully reſume. If they did, it would be a robbery, and they would have a right to do themſelves juſtice by the moſt effective means in their power. And had our Anceſtors in this country been ſo *neceſſitated* (not ſo mad) as to have ſubjected themſelves to any foreign Community, not by conqueſt, nor by artifice, but by compact, for a valuable conſideration, ſuch as for ſuccour and protection againſt a too powerful enemy, as above mentioned, or for countenance and aſſiſtance, in a ſtate of infancy, or upon any or what account ſoever, by which both parties expected to be gainers, then I ſay we ſhould have been under an inviolable obligation, to have continued in ſuch a State, whatever it had been, till we had been releaſed by ſuch Community, upon giving them what they might agree to accept as a fair equivalent.

Some men affect to make a very pompous parade of the unalienable rights of human nature, without ſeeming to have any ſettled clear idea of the import of the phraſe. The unalienable rights of nature, as I conceive, are, properly ſpeaking, the faculties of body

body and mind which human nature is indued with; and human liberty is the free, unmoleſted exerciſe of thoſe faculties, for our own uſe and benefit without prejudice to others. From hence it follows, that man by nature has no right to property, till by labour and induſtry he has acquired it. From hence property originated, and a right to it became perſonal; and from hence it appears what rights are alienable and what are unalienable. Of the latter we have very few; life, limbs, and faculties. Theſe are the gift of God, and are at his diſpoſal only. They are neceſſary to our exiſtence, and therefore are truly unalienable. With reſpect to any thing elſe, we have no natural right, and therefore we neither poſſeſs nor can poſſibly acquire any thing but what is alienable, or what we have a right to diſpoſe of agreeably to our own wills, or as circumſtances may render fit and reaſonable for the benefit of ourſelves and poſterity. I therefore cannot diſpoſe of my children, nor bind them againſt their conſent; as ſoon as they are able, they have a right by nature to ſhift for themſelves, and I neither have myſelf any further power over them, nor can I beſtow any on another. As to my property, nature has given them no right to, that's at my own diſpoſal in whatever manner

manner I pleaſe. If I neglect to do it in my life time, they will inherit it among them, not by right of nature, but by the municipal laws and political wiſdom of the State, under ſuch proviſoes and reſtrictions, as every other perſon is obliged to ſubmit to. If they call this ſlavery, and had rather renounce their birthright than accept it upon the terms appointed by the legiſlature, they have the whole world before them, and may breath a freer air wherever they can find it; but let them not fooliſhly imagine that there is any ſuch State to be found on earth, where the ſubjects life, liberty, and property are protected without paying a proportionable ſhare of the expence neceſſarily attending the ſame.

In every Empire a ſupreme legiſlative authority over the whole muſt exiſt ſomewhere, with an adequate power to controul and bind all and every part of which it conſiſts; otherwiſe it would be an Empire without government, without laws, and without power: A vaſt collection of people preying upon one another, without any thing to govern them but their own wills. Government, like all other human arts, is very far from being perfect, even in thoſe which are the beſt conſtituted. The good

of

of the ſubject is the principal object of Government, and that is the moſt perfect which beſt anſwers that end. The moſt probable means of effecting this, ſeems to be a repreſentation proportioned to the degree of intereſt each man has to ſecure, eſpecially, as was before obſerved, as his expences are always proportioned thereto. But ſhould it ſo happen that a State is partially repreſented, and ſome men employed who have a greater regard to their own private intereſt, than to the good of the State, or the happineſs of the people, we muſt not haſtily conclude, that the nation is inſlaved, becauſe the State is impoveriſhed, nor may we hope to mend our condition by violent oppoſition to the meaſure of Government; this, inſtead of mending, would only aggravate the evil, and render it more obſtinate and permanent, and finally produce and eſtabliſh the very thing it ſeemed ſo ſtrenuouſly to oppoſe. It muſt be obvious to every one, that, as the difficulties of Government increaſe, the number of its forces will multiply, and the expence of ſupporting them muſt be proportioned thereto; beſides many indirect means, attended with an amazing expence, to make friends who make a virtue of being in the oppoſition, till it appears to be their intereſt to be otherwiſe. Be it as it will, violent oppoſition

poſition is as fooliſh as it is dangerous, unleſs thoſe who make it, really mean to accelerate that ruin which they prophecy is faſt approaching. I dare not gueſs at any man's intention; but I will venture to ſay, that ſuch publications, which are calculated to alarm fear, to promote diſaffection, excite rage, and countenance rebellion, have the moſt direct tendency to the immediate production of the wretched cataſtrophe it fooliſhly, if not inſidiouſly, ſo earneſtly deprecates.

PART

PART II.

WE are at length arrived at the Second Part of the Doctor's Book. In the foregoing Remarks I think it has been ſhewn, that his leading principle is ſophiſtically defined and applied; and that the conſequences deduced therefrom are not only capable of being diſputed, but have been ſhewn to be falſe and dangerous. If the King of Great Britain is the King of the Britiſh Colonies in America; if the Dominion of theſe Colonies is of right in him, then I apprehend it is capable of ſtrict demonſtration, that the claims of this kingdom are reconcileable to the principles of true Liberty and legitimate Government. If the contrary is capable of being proved, I think it will follow, as an unavoidable conſequence, that the King of Great Britain has no Right of Sovereignty or Dominion in America, if any thing more be meant by the terms than a mere nominal Sovereignty.

It is true, the common phraſeology among all degrees of people has been, and will, I hope, continue to be, *our* Colonies, not-

withſtanding the unpatriotic hope of our Author: A hope, which includes in it ſucceſs to the rebellious Enemies of his King and Country, and the ſubverſion of thoſe Laws by which he is protected, and Civil Liberty defended. A bleſſing every one is ſurely unworthy of, who is ſo zealouſly indefatigable in the means of its deſtruction. It is very uncandid to ſuppoſe, that the phraſe *our Colonies*, in the mouths of the meaneſt, or of any perſons among us, denotes a belief that *they* have a body of ſubjects in America: It denotes a truth of much more importance, viz. that the Colonies have been univerſally underſtood, from the firſt day of their being poſſeſſed by the Engliſh to the preſent hour, to be the *Dominions* of the King of Great Britain, and ſubject in all things to the Legiſlature of this country. They never ſuppoſed the people of the Colonies were in a ſtate of ſubordination to the people of England, as holding their exiſtence for our uſe only. To ſay the leaſt, this is a moſt uncandid miſrepreſentation of facts; for the Engliſh never thought nor treated them otherwiſe than as fellow-ſubjects, governed by the ſame Legiſlature, as they knew they were protected by the ſame Government, at the common expence of all its ſubjects, and enjoyed all the

the privileges the firſt ſubject in Britain could have done under the ſame circumſtances. The phraſe, *our Colonies*, therefore, in the mouths of all the world, as well as in the mouths of the Engliſh, clearly demonſtrates, that the *claims* of Great Britain are not new *claims*, but have been univerſally acknowledged from the beginning, and their legitimacy never diſputed, unleſs perhaps by a few men of ſeditious ſpirits, who have neither hopes from, nor pleaſure in, what would make the reſt of the world happy.

That the Doctor ſhould have choſen to try the queſtion by the general principles of Civil Liberty, is not in the leaſt ſurprizing; but that he ſhould deſire that it may be attended to that he has done ſo, is ſomething wonderful! for, as I conceive, there never was a more palpable abuſe offered to the underſtanding of man. There is certainly great artifice, where one has an inclination to miſlead the judgment, in contriving to try the merits of a queſtion, which is entirely conſtituted of particulars, by general principles which include none of thoſe particulars. The relation that ſubſiſts between Great Britain and her Colonies, and the *claims* the former make on the latter, were created by certain circumſtances; the queſ-

tion then is, whether thoſe circumſtances are ſufficiently ſolid to ſupport the claims? The Doctor, with much ingenuity, but not a grain of candour, chuſes to try the queſtion by the general principles of Civil Liberty abſtractedly conſidered; ſuperſeding or reſcinding every circumſtance that could poſſibly determine the judgment either on one ſide of the queſtion or the other: He therefore very prudently declines enquiring into the *practice of former times*, or into the validity of Charters; becauſe, in that very practice, of which Charters are the inconteſtible vouchers, the right of the claims are founded. But if the queſtion ſhould be tried by the principles of Civil Liberty, it would, in its naked ſimple form, ſtand thus: Whether one country has a natural right of dominion over another country at 3000 miles diſtance? If it be ſaid it has, I ſhould be glad to know by what rule it is to be known which is to poſſeſs the Sovereignty, and which to be in ſubjection? Is Britain to govern America, or to be governed by it? The Doctor, perhaps agreeably to his wiſh, thinks the latter. I hope he is miſtaken; but I defy him to make out any right at all as he has ſtated the queſtion, which is the very thing he aimed at; for it has no more to do with the diſpute than it has with the

queſtion.

queſtion, Whether Great Britain has any right of dominion in the Moon? The principles of Civil Liberty are equally concluſive againſt one as againſt the other, and therefore the trying it by thoſe principles is as futile as the concluſions are falſe. Indeed, he has brought this queſtion to a teſt ſo high, that the particulars by which the truth of it is to be aſcertained is become inviſible, and therefore he found himſelf at liberty to bring it to ſuch an iſſue as he pleaſed, which he thinks a ſure iſſue. But it is ſaid, "The queſtion, with all liberal enquirers, ought to be, not what juriſdiction over them *Precedents*, *Statutes*, and *Charters* give, but what Reaſon and Equity and the Rights of Humanity give?" Here the Doctor is again playing the part of the Devil in MILTON, inveloping and rolling himſelf along in a fog. My next door neighbour has a diſpute with his Landlord relating to the payment of the taxes of his houſe: I wiſh the Doctor would be ſo good as to tell me, from the general principles of Reaſon and Equity, and the Rights of Humanity, whether the Landlord or Tenant has right on his ſide? You aſk, How is that poſſible, ſeeing the Doctor is an abſolute ſtranger to every condition of the agreement between them; he has never ſeen the Leaſe, nor any Memorandum

dum relating to it; how then is he to judge of what he knows nothing in the world about? That is nothing to the purpoſe, the Doctor has a method of trying particular queſtions by general principles which has no particular relation to ſuch queſtions; therefore it is juſt as eaſy to decide the queſtion between the Landlord and Tenant without ſeeing the Leaſe, &c. between them, as it is the merit of Great Britain's claim on the Colonies, without any knowledge of former *Tranſactions*, *Precedents*, *Statutes*, *Charters*, &c. But there is ſomething much more criminal in the Doctor's pretended method of forming a judgment, without a proper knowledge of facts upon which the merit of the queſtion depends; it is, in ſmothering and ſuppreſſing facts eſtabliſhed on Precedents, Statutes, and Charters, all which bear the plaineſt and moſt indiſputable evidence of the rectitude of the claim which he ſo zealouſly denies. It is juſt as if, after reading a Leaſe between Landlord and Tenant, wherein it is particularly covenanted that the *Tenant* ſhall bear and pay all manner of taxes whatever, one ſhould ſay, I chooſe to try this queſtion by the general Principles of Reaſon and Equity, and the Rights of Humanity; as if theſe general Principles do not equally reſpect each Claimant; and

if

if they do, how are they applicable to either, without a previous knowledge of that to which they are to be applied. Their general nature determines nothing; they may give the right to A, or they may give it to B, but they neither can nor will give it to either, till the particular circumſtances on which the rights depend, and are to be aſcertained, are known and underſtood: Not general abſtract principles of nature, but thoſe particular relations which circumſtances create between man and man, between one country and another; in ſhort, thoſe very acts and deeds which are ſtudiouſly ſecluded from human ſight, are the only principles by which the rights of men can be aſcertained conſiſtently with reaſon and equity, and the principles of Civil Liberty. The queſtion is indeed new, and not leſs aſtoniſhing. Even the Doctor cannot ſpeak of it without betraying the cauſe he wiſhes to defend. Can a country branch itſelf out without retaining a right in its branches? Should they become ſuperior, would that deſtroy the parent's right? Can it be conſidered on the general ground of reaſon and juſtice, without the knowledge and conſideration of the particular facts to which reaſon and juſtice are to be applied? If, from ſmall beginnings, they have increaſed,

creaſed, and formed a body of powerful States under free Legiſlatures of their own, were they not, during *all* that long period, protected, aſſiſted, and cheriſhed at the expence of the Parent State; and were they not always ſubject to ſuch regulations and diſpoſitions as the Legiſlature of the Parent State thought proper to make? Shocking, indeed, it is for human nature to ſettle diſputes by the ſword! The meaſures cannot be more deteſted, than thoſe who occaſioned them are deteſtable. What part thoſe have in it who have countenanced and ſpirited up the unnatural rebellion which occaſioned it, and are ſtill fanning the flames by defending it, I wiſh they would ſeriouſly conſider, and no longer perſiſt in abetting meaſures, that muſt ruin one country, may ruin both, under the wicked pretence of curing the very evils they have cheriſhed, from their infancy to their preſent monſtrous extent, by purſuing the ſame moſt infamous meaſures. "The duty we owe our gracious Sovereign obliges us to rely on his diſpoſition to ſtay the ſword," ſeems to me a phraſe very obſcure at leaſt, if not unintelligible. Our duty to ſubmit to the will of our Sovereign, in conformity to the Laws, I clearly underſtand; but the duty of relying on any one's diſpoſition for mercy, while we

we deny the duty of paying obedience to the juſt and legitimate demands of him from whom mercy is expected, is a duty (if it be one) neither founded in nature nor reaſon, nor any one principle of the human underſtanding. I muſt therefore leave this among the reſt of the Doctor's myſterious Politics, which none but himſelf can explain.

SECTION I.

Of the JUSTICE *of the* WAR *with* AMERICA.

"THE enquiry, whether the war with the Colonies is a *juſt* war," can *only* be determined, not by ſtating the *power* over them, but by ſtating the *right* over them, which it is the end of the war to maintain. This is not ſo well defined in the words of the Act cited by the Doctor, as I think it might have been. As ſuppoſe thus: That this kingdom has right to make Laws and Statutes to bind the Colonies and People of America, in all caſes whatever, and to exerciſe every act of power neceſſary to enforce obedience thereto. Power without right is "dreadful power, indeed!" but power to enforce right is not only juſt but neceſſary. A Government, without ſuch

ſary power is very precarious, and indeed improperly called a Government; for how can it be ſaid to govern thoſe whom it cannot compel to obey, or puniſh for diſobeying. So that power exerted without or againſt right, may be productive of ſlavery, but exerted to protect and enforce right is to preſerve from ſlavery. The Doctor therefore, by ſubſtituting *power* for *right*, has ſadly waſted his time, for whatever arguments conclude againſt the former, can by no poſſible means be brought againſt the latter.

If it be true, "that the united Legiſlatures of *England* and *Scotland* have of right power to tax the Colonies, and a ſupremacy of legiſlation over America," they have, as we have ſhewn, a right of exerciſing that power, and of enforcing obedience. It therefore means ſomething, but by no means, "that the property of the Colonies are ſubject to the abſolute diſcretion of Great Britain," in the ſenſe here intended. "The nature of the thing admits of great limitation," though of none from the *right* of the Colonies, for they have no more right to judge how far the authority over them in theſe caſes ſhall extend, than other individuals whereſoever they reſide, who are ſubjects

jects of Great Britain. If *they* had a right to limit Great Britain in its legiſlation, Great Britain would very improperly be called a Government; for in that caſe its Government would be in America. There can be no limitation of ſupreme power but what is founded in moral rectitude. The principles of limitation can exiſt no where but in itſelf; for to ſuppoſe a ſupreme power capable of being limitted by any exterior power, is to ſay, that a ſupreme power is not a ſupreme power, which is nonſenſe. "If *any* part of their property is ſubject to our diſcretion, the *whole* muſt be ſo." Let any man here apply this to himſelf, he will readily diſcover both the folly and the falſhood of the aſſertion. There is a ſtudied ambiguity in the words *our diſcretion*. *Our* means the Legiſlature if it means any thing, and *diſcretion* means enacting ſuch laws as to it ſhall ſeem meet and fit to protect the right and property of the ſubject; not to rob them of it, as the Doctor would have the world believe. The latter is a vile proſtitution of the meaning of *diſcretion*, and a virulent *libel* on Government. Life and property can only be defended and protected by life and property, and that Government which has not both right and power to determine on the means, and en-

force the execution of ſuch meaſures as are neceſſary to ſupport the ends of its inſtitution, is unworthy of the name of Government, as being ineffectual to anſwer any one good purpoſe whatever. Government cannot be ſupported but at a heavy expence, and that expence muſt be borne by the people: Taxation therefore is *neceſſarily* annexed to Government, and by no means of itſelf to be reprobated. It only becomes obnoxious when made unneceſſarily heavy, or when one part of the people are unjuſtly made to bear the whole. That Great Britain ſhould bear the whole, and the Colonies be exonerated, the Americans think is juſt, and Dr. PRICE has undertaken to maintain it; for, ſays he, "if you have a right to *any* of their property, you have a right to the *whole*, and this leaves them nothing they can call *their own*." If this be true of them, it is alſo true of us, it is univerſally true. Government therefore, according to his principles, is a political inſtitution, not to protect and defend the rights of the people, as it pretends, but to rob, enſlave, and betray them. Again, "And what is it (ſays he) that can give to any people ſuch a ſupremacy over another people?" I anſwer, if by any people, the people of Great Britain are meant, and over another

another people, the Americans, then the queſtion is without a meaning; for they are not to be conſidered as diſtinct people, one having ſupremacy over the other, but as one people, ſubjects of the ſame Sovereign, protected by the ſame Government, and therefore bound, by every tie of duty, to contribute a proportionable ſhare towards the ſupport of the ſame.

In every free Government there muſt be a right to govern, and a power to execute ſuch right, and that in Great Britain can be lodged no where but in its Legiſlature, "in order to preſerve the UNITY of the Britiſh Empire." But why this ſhould be thought a plea to juſtify tyranny, I ſhould be glad to be informed. Can the foes of Government, and abettors of anarchy tell us, how Peace, Tranquillity, and Civil Liberty can be maintained without either right or power? Whatever oppreſſions the claims of the POPE may have occaſioned, is not our preſent buſineſs to enquire; but if UNITY, either in Church or State, has any tendency to produce diſcord and miſchief, it muſt be a kind of Unity not commonly denoted by the word; like the Doctor's idea of Right and Civil Liberty, the former often means Power, and the latter that every man is his

own

own Legiſlator: For Liberty is too imperfectly defined when it is ſaid to be "a Government by LAWS and not by MEN." But whatever may be his idea of Unity, it is extremely evident, that if the ſubjects of a Government are not indiſcriminately and impartially made to unite in bearing the neceſſary burthen of the State, the unjuſt partiality can produce nothing but diſcord and miſchief, and this unrighteous attempt is the foundation of the preſent evil. I ſhould be glad to know what a common relation to one ſupreme executive head means, when every aid, neceſſary to ſupport that common relation, is denied and withheld by a large part of the people? Can any relation with the leaſt truth or propriety be called common, where one part of the people is to bear the whole of the burthen, and the other none? Can ſuch a relation be compatible with an exchange of kind offices, ties of intereſt, and affection, or produce unity, when its direct tendency is to diſunite the people, and produce affections diametrically oppoſite to thoſe mentioned? All this is nothing more than plauſible harangue to impoſe on the weakneſs of mankind, to inſlave Great Britain, and to eſtabliſh the ſeat of Empire in America on its ruins.

Much

Much has been ſaid of "the *ſuperiority* of the Britiſh State." What has been ſaid? Do the people of Great Britain claim any ſuperiority over the people of the Colonies? I deny it. They claim nothing but to be upon a fair equitable footing; no ſuperiority, but an equality. Let Americans, as well as Britons, bear a fair proportion towards the ſupport of the Government by which they are equally protected, and they aſk no more; to treat this as being unjuſt, is to deny common ſenſe, and inſult the underſtanding. Such a one muſt be an enemy to truth, a traitor to his King and Country, and a foe to the bleſſings of peace and the rights of mankind. If *ſuperiority* relates to Government, and not to the people, the queſtion, What gives us our ſuperiority? is exceedingly ridiculous. It is the ſame thing as aſking, what gives Government ſuperiority over the governed, or a community over the individuals of which it is compoſed? It is the Conſtitution. It is the ſame which gives it a ſuperiority over its ſubjects here. It is neither *Wealth, Number of People, nor Knowledge and Virtue,* but *Right* and *Juſtice,* the ends for which Government was inſtituted, to protect every man equally, and to compel every member

to

to bear a proportionable ſhare in maintaining the ſame.

'But we are the PARENT STATE.'—"Theſe are the magic words which have faſcinated and miſled us." Wherein have they miſled us? Has Great Britain no better right to found its demands upon, than that the Americans went from England? If it has, how diſingenuous and uncandid to aſk, if, becauſe the Engliſh came from *Germany*, does that give the *German* States a right to tax us? Such ſophiſtry is highly diſreputable to one who pretends to a friendſhip for truth and rectitude. His argument, deduced from the authority of parents, is equally falſe and ridiculous, both in his reaſoning and concluſion. When the authority of the Parent ceaſes, and Children become independent agents, are they independent of the Government under which they were born and by which they are protected. The order of Nature, in eſtabliſhing the relation between Parents and Children, has been the rule of Great Britain's conduct towards the Colonies, but it ought not to forget, in juſtice to their brethren here, that the Parent State is alſo the governing State, and has a right to their obedience as Subjects, if not an authority to compel the perform-

performance of their duty as children; and ſurely their diſobedience and ingratitude do not merit a relaxation of authority, but a rigorous execution of coercive meaſures, proportioned to their unnatural rebellion.

That "we have protected them, and run deeply in debt on their account," no one, I believe, will be ſo hardy as to deny; the anſwer to this, (in p. 26,) though called a full anſwer, has, I conceive, been fully refuted. That Government had a view to the intereſt of Great Britain, as well as to the intereſt of her people in America, it would be injurious to its honour not to believe; but does that deſtroy its right over one part of its ſubjects, becauſe it has made the reſt an object of equal regard? I will admit that there has been a reciprocal intereſt maintained between the two countries, and that a very great number of Merchants and Tradeſmen here, as well as there, have been greatly benefited thereby. But it is by no means clear, upon a general balance between the two countries, that Great Britain is a gainer. As a State, I think it would have been much happier, and more opulent, had it never known it, though individuals may have been greatly enriched, as ſome would by the moſt pernicious com-

merce that ever exiſted. The Doctor aſks if they have not enabled us to do many things for our advantage, particularly to bear the burthen of our debts? Let me aſk him, if all theſe, added together, will be *half* ſufficient to diſcharge the debt we have contracted on their account? Verily I think not; but whether they would or not is nothing to the queſtion, for theſe facts do not conſtitute the right of dominion, nor can they deſtroy it, be the merits on which ſide ſoever it may, but they are undeniable proofs of its exiſtence. They certainly have ſubmitted as far as they thought it conſiſtent with their own *advantage*; but thoſe who have good reaſon to know them well, tell us, they have made that their rule of action, rather than the juſtice of the laws, or loyalty to their Prince. "Muſt they likewiſe reſign to us the diſpoſal of their property," is the queſtion of an Incendiary, which has nothing to ſupport it but the ſeditious principles of him that aſks it. Was it not in America they fought in *our wars*, by our ſides? And if they were our wars, was not the country alſo ours? If it was, how came it now to be theirs? If the ſucceſs was ours, were not the *fruits* of that ſucceſs alſo *ours?* If ſo, how came they now to be ſolely theirs? If they ran themſelves

ſelves deeply in debt to aſſiſt us, and the Parliament thought it *juſt* to allow them conſiderable ſums, they having exceeded their abilities; does not ſuch aſſiſtance given on their ſide, and compenſation made on ours, give the cleareſt proofs that the country which was the object of the war was ours; if ſo, pray how came it now to be theirs? "And in this courſe they would have continued many future years," &c. What courſe? in aſſiſting us to protect them, in receiving compenſations for their aſſiſtance, and claiming the ſole right of the property obtained, at the expence of ſo much Britiſh blood and treaſure. Theſe are the rewards that we are told might have laſted for ever! Can any one read ſuch a ſtring of contradictions, without feeling the heat of reſentment at ſo palpable an impoſition offered to his underſtanding?

"But how came the land on which they ſettled to be ours?" By the very ſame means that England came to be ours, if *ours* relates to our dominion over the country. Will the Doctor ſay we have no right but what ſailing along the coaſt could give us? If we have, why ſhould he endeavour to make the Reader believe our right in it is chimerical, being no better founded? If a great part of

it was bought of the natives, could they ſell it free of the Sovereign's right in it? The Doctor ſhould know, landed property always paſſes with its incumbrances, and the right of dominion is as much the property of the Sovereign, as the land is of the owner. But it is ſaid, "They have ſince cleared and cultivated it, and without any help from us," &c. Is there any one ſo ignorant as not to perceive the falſhood of the aſſertion? The next paragraph will fully refute it.

It is allowed here, "that our brethren in America ſettled there under the faith of Charters, which promiſed them the enjoyment of all the rights of *Engliſhmen*;" we will add, that they have been hitherto indulged with privileges that Engliſhmen could not aſk. But if they ſettled under the faith of Charters, it is plain they had no rights but what thoſe Charters gave them; for if they derived their rights from a higher ſource, as hath been weakly and falſely aſſerted, why ſhould they *petition* for Charters, when they already poſſeſſed better titles than Charters could beſtow? But it may be ſaid, perhaps, that they did not petition, but that the Charters were crammed down their throats to make them rich, as good houſewives cram their turkeys to make them fat.

ſat. Whatever may be the condition of their Charters, their bare exiſtence proves undeniably, that the rights of the Coloniſts originated from thoſe Charters, and they have no rights but what they conveyed. But though the idea of mens holding lands, &c. by virtue of Charters includes in it the ideas of ſupremacy and dominion on one hand, and duty and ſubjection on the other, yet it by no means follows, that the conditions ſhall always be made good by the *grantor*; for in a limited monarchy, where the Sovereign's will and power are bounded by the laws, ſhould he make a grant contrary to the laws, or by which the rights of the reſt of his ſubjects would be infringed, the grant, ſo far, would be null and void; for no man, be his ſtation whatever it may, can give a right to another which he has not himſelf. Charters could never excuſe the Coloniſts from the common duty of ſubjects, nor could Royal Authority alone exonerate them from taxation, though the Legiſlature, ſo long as it thought it for the common good, might forbear to tax them. It is ridiculous, to the laſt degree, to talk of the people, from whom they withdrew, being maſters of their property, when nothing more is required than a fair and equitable proportion. Can any thing be more

more inconſiſtent with common ſenſe and the plaineſt rules of equity, than that, becauſe the Colonies have been ſupported for more than a century at the expence of the ſubjects of the Mother-country, by means of which, in part, they have contracted debts too heavy to be borne, they muſt for ever continue to ſupport them, or they will deny their duty and obedience to their Sovereign, and their ſubjection to the laws? That he lays no ſtreſs on Charters I do not wonder, becauſe they deſtroy the ſtreſs of all he has ſaid; but I own it is to me a matter of great wonder, that in his opinion they are not bound by expreſs ſtipulations; as if men had no ties, no obligations, but what quadrated with their own private intereſts. Indeed this doctrine pervades the whole performance; right is explained by power; man's will is his law; and the rights of nature are whatever he has ability to procure; and no compacts or ſtipulations, be the conſiderations whatever they may, can or ought to bind him, any more than a ſtipulation to expoſe himſelf to be deſtroyed by wolves and tigers.

Was it ever ſaid, that becauſe the repreſentation of this kingdom is defective, we have a right to tax *America*? Was the right

right of taxing grounded on a partial and too narrow ſcale of repreſentation here? Indeed, the Doctor is capable of much more than I had ever conceived. His performance may be adored by thoſe who breath nothing but the unhallowed fumes of ſedition, and they may perpetuate their folly and their ſhame, by offering their incenſe to him in a gold box; but when party rage and paſſion ſubſide, and his book is viewed in the calm and diſpaſſionate light of reaſon and truth, co-operating for the peace, harmony, and happineſs of mankind, it will be found fraught with principles of a moſt malignant nature, ſubverſive of all government, deſtructive of true liberty, oppoſing the will of individuals to the ſacred ties of civil ſociety, and propagating univerſally the laws of nature and the inherent rights of man, in oppoſition to the beſt modeled ſtate of government. That "we ſubmit to a Parliament that does not repreſent us," is not true; we are repreſented by our Parliament, and ſo is every ſubject of Great Britain, be his reſidence wherever it may, and every ſubject is *equally* obliged of right to pay due obedience to the laws. It is true, the choice of Members to repreſent us is far from being adequate; what is neceſſary to that purpoſe has been already ſhewn;

but

but ſtill the choice and the repreſentation is ſuch as is agreeable to the Conſtitution, though, through the inevitable viciſſitudes that happen to all human affairs, the choice is perhaps much leſs adequate than it was. But though this ſtrongly marks the propriety and expediency of a more general and better proportioned choice, no man in his ſenſes would urge, becauſe our Government is imperfect, and perhaps ſome men are ſacrificing the good of the public to their own private advantage, that therefore the laws of our Legiſlature are not binding, and every man is at liberty to purſue his own will. For where there is no law, there can be no violation of law, and conſequently no right to puniſh; and if this ſtrange doctrine is true in reſpect to the ſubjects in the Colonies, it is equally true here; and every act of power to compel obedience, if it be tyranny there, it is *equally* ſo here; and by theſe principles the Government is tyrannical, and the perſon, in whom the executive power is lodged, is a *Deſpot* and a *Tyrant*, who is cruelly butchering an innocent people for ſtanding up in defence of their rights. Thus the evil of rebellion is fathered upon Government, and a moſt humane Prince opprobriouſly ſtigmatized a Tyrant, to give countenance to rebels abroad,

abroad, and to excite the ſame deſtructive rage at home. This is far from being an exaggeration, the remainder of the paragraph fully juſtifies the conſtruction. What can be more treaſonable than to earneſtly wiſh ſucceſs to the arms of traitors and rebels, who, under the falſe pretence of defending liberty, are, upon the principles of fanatics and republicans, endeavouring, with all their might, to deſtroy the conſtitution and freedom of their country?

"That *America* has no more right to be exempted from taxation by the *Britiſh* Parliament, than *Britain* itſelf," Dr. PRICE ſays is by no means true.—However, he has not been able to aſſign one ſatisfactory reaſon to the contrary. *Here*, not only all Freeholders, and Burgeſſes in Boroughs, but every individual perſon is repreſented: *There*, every *Freeholder*, and every other perſon, is repreſented alſo, as far as the laws of the Britiſh Parliament at any time concern them. His argument, if worthy of the name, is founded on the fallacious uſe of the word *Repreſentation*; according to which, no perſon is, or can be repreſented, but thoſe who have an actual choice in the appointment of the Repreſentatives. To ſhew how exceedingly abſurd this conſtruction of the word is, we need only conſider how very

few, in this ſenſe, of the people of Great Britain, are repreſented, in compariſon of the whole; not one in ten, perhaps not many more than one in a hundred. Now, by the Conſtitution of this kingdom, repreſentation is as neceſſary to the conſtruction of every law as to thoſe of taxation; conſequently, if not above one in a hundred has a right in the choice of Repreſentatives, not above one in a hundred is a proper object of our laws, nor amenable to them. For if a perſon has no right to aſſiſt in the choice of Repreſentatives, according to this futile doctrine, ſuch perſon is not repreſented; and if not repreſented, he cannot of right be taxed, and by a parity of reaſon he cannot of right be puniſhed, nor can any law whatever be made which can of right affect him; for, by our Conſtitution, repreſentation is neceſſary to every law. From hence it is plain, if the Doctor's argument of non-repreſentation protects the Americans from the operation of our laws, it equally abſolves the far greater part of the people of Great Britain; for non-repreſentation, in his ſenſe, operates as efficaciouſly here as there; a concluſion too groſly abſurd to be borne. Great ſtreſs has been laid upon the ſophiſtical abuſe of this word, without the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon to countenance it. Every one knows the Legiſlature of this kingdom is compoſed of the three

three Eſtates of King, Lords, and Commons; their joint concurrence is neceſſary to every law, and no law can paſs without it. The Commons repreſent the people, and are choſen and appointed agreeably to the laws and conſtitution of the realm, not by the whole people, but by ſuch only as are duly qualified, according to the uſages, cuſtoms, and laws made and eſtabliſhed for that purpoſe; but as the Commons repreſent the whole people, all others as well as themſelves, ſo the Electors chooſe for all others as well as themſelves, and *all* are fully and equally repreſented and bound by the laws, thoſe who have not, as well as thoſe who have votes, to all intents and purpoſes; and in this ſenſe, and agreeably to this uſage, hath repreſentation been underſtood and practiſed, from the earlieſt accounts of Parliaments to the preſent time. The annexing repreſentation in this new-fangled ſenſe to taxation in particular, is a novel invention of ſeditious complexion, calculated to miſlead the weak and diſtreſs Government by its moſt inveterate and malignant enemies; if the corruptions of men's hearts are to be eſtimated by the evil tendency of their actions.—It is however true, the laws made here reſpecting the ſubjects in America, would not include their fellow ſubjects here;

a tax might be laid upon them, which could not affect us, as thouſands have upon us, which did not affect them; and it is obvious that this power may be abuſed, as every delegated power whatever is liable; therefore, if power can be lodged no where conſiſtently with general good, unleſs abſolute ſecurity can be given that ſuch delegated power ſhall not be abuſed, there is an end to all government upon the face of the earth. Perfection is not to be expected from imperfect agents. However, notwithſtanding the frightful daubings of the Doctor's bruſh, the condition of America in this reſpect, is very far from being ſo black and horrible as he is pleaſed to repreſent it; their intereſt ſtands upon as good ground, in reſpect to any laws that can be made here, as their brethren's in Great Britain. Our Merchants and Manufacturers to an amazing number, men of great opulence and abilities, are intimately connected with them, by commercial ties and reciprocal intereſts, and many of our Repreſentatives have great landed, as well as other property there, and are therefore bound by motives, which operate the moſt forcibly on the human mind, to be watchful that they may have no juſt cauſe of complaint; becauſe they cannot be materially injured without their correſpondents here ſharing the injury

with

with them. And whoever has attended to the ſpirit of the times for ten years back, muſt have remarked a bias amazingly partial and predominant in favour of America, not only in thoſe whoſe judgments were forcibly warped by intereſt, but others of very reſpectable character, fortune, and abilities; by motives not leſs powerful, tho' infinitely more diſhonourable; motives of pernicious oppoſition to every meaſure of Adminiſtration, whether founded in truth, reaſon, and juſtice, and calculated to promote the good and happineſs of ſociety; or whether they were meant to ſerve the purpoſes of avarice, ambition, and private intereſt, they meet with the ſame determined rigorous oppoſition, and the peace and good of the people are ſacrificed to the party rage and wicked hopes of thoſe whoſe duty it is to protect them. There might, indeed, be ſome difficulty in proportioning what each country ſhould pay to the ſatisfaction of all, but certainly thoſe who think it unjuſt the Coloniſts ſhould bear any part of the expence, would muſter all their forces long before they were ſubjected to a moderate ſhare of the burthen. In this caſe the people taxed, and thoſe who tax, have *not* ſeparate intereſts; for the intereſts of the latter are ſo intimately connected with, and

ſo

ſo ſubſtantially depend upon the former, that there are motives of infinitely greater power and efficacy than either the ability of the *taxed*, or humanity of the *taxers*. But even admitting that ſuch a taxation ſhould be attended with ſome difficulties not eaſy to be remedied, it would be as futile to deny the right of obligation, as it would be to deny the juſtice of a debt, becauſe of the difficulty of remitting the money. Whenever the Legiſlature here ſhall, by any ways or means whatever, lay more than a fair and reaſonable proportion of the public burthen upon them, they will then, and not till then, have juſt cauſe of complaint; but for the above cogent reaſons it is morally certain that is never likely to happen. As ſubjects of Britain they are equally repreſented with all others its ſubjects. By the conſtitution of this Government nothing can entitle a man to a choice of Repreſentatives, but his being a Freeholder, or a Burgeſs; if he is either, his being an American cannot deprive him of his vote: Neither, he being duly qualified, does his being of that country deprive him of a ſeat in that auguſt Aſſembly, as it is well known men of very large property there have been Members of Parliament here; therefore it clearly follows, that the Coloniſts are not only *virtu-*

ally

ally but *literally* repreſented here as Britons are, that is, according to the conſtitutional cuſtoms, uſages, and rights of this kingdom. A Coloniſt, if duly qualified, may be an Elector, or a Repreſentative, the ſame as an Engliſhman. It is the qualification that beſtows the right, not the country. An American then may enjoy both theſe privileges, while ſome millions of Britons have it not in their power to enjoy either. Let it not be ſaid then that they are not repreſented. Similar qualifications give them equal conſtitutional rights, and it would be unconſtitutional for either to exerciſe the right without the qualification.

Would a Writer ingratiate himſelf with the Public, let him write a *Libel* on *Government*, paint his King a tyrant, his Miniſters a band of Deſpots, every Stateſman a knave, the moſt opulent and reſpectable Corporation in the world, upon whom the ſalvation and proſperity of this Nation in a great meaſure depend, as ſtanding on the *edge* of a precipice, with its head in the clouds, ready to tumble into ruins with the firſt adverſe puff it may encounter, overwhelming and ſinking this once flouriſhing kingdom in one general chaos of devaſtation and irremediable diſſolution; his deſires would be crowned with

with all that vanity could hope, or enthuſiaſm inſpire.

" Whether, in reſpect of taxation and internal legiſlation, the Colonies are of *right* bound to be ſubject to the juriſdiction of this kingdom, is indeed now the queſtion." It is not, however, the previous queſtion. That is, whether the King of Great Britain, as ſuch, has any right of dominion over the Colonies; or, in other words, whether the people of the Colonies are of right the ſubjects of the King of Great Britain, as King of Great Britain? If they are not his ſubjects, he has no right of dominion over them, and they are not bound, nor of right can be bound, to be ſubject to the juriſdiction of this kingdom. On the other hand, if they are his ſubjects, they are then bound to be ſubject to the juriſdiction of this kingdom. That they are ſubjects of the King of Great Britain, it is unneceſſary to go about to prove, becauſe they themſelves fully acknowledge it. And if they are his ſubjects, they are bound to be ſubject to the legiſlature of this kingdom, for they can by no means be his ſubjects in any ſenſe that is not agreeable to the legiſlature of this kingdom, nor can he of right command their ſubjection in any way the

Legiſla-

Legiſlature does not give him. His dominion over them then can only be exerciſed agreeably to the laws of the Britiſh Parliament, nor can he veſt any rights in them that are repugnant thereto; yet the Britiſh Parliament "*has not a right to diſpoſe of their property, and to model, as it pleaſes, their Governments,*" in the ſophiſtical ſenſe of the Doctor. It has no right to the diſpoſal of their property, nor to the modelation of their laws, more than it has to the property and the laws of Britons, which is ſo far only as is neceſſary and fit to ſupport the Government which protects them, and ſecures to them the peaceable enjoyment of all they poſſeſs. If to diſpoſe of their property, *as it pleaſes*, means any thing different from this, it is *falſe* and *ſcandalous* in every poſſible conſtruction. It is what the Parliament never meant, it is what they cannot practiſe, without deſtroying thoſe conſtitutional powers which ſecure to them the peaceable enjoyment of their own rights of Liberty and Property. To ſay, therefore, to tax the people for the neceſſary ſupport of the Government, which protects and ſecures them, is the ſame as to diſpoſe of their property *as it pleaſes*, is a *ſcandalous and dangerous libel* againſt the Government and Conſtitutional Rights of this kingdom; the

iſſue of the over-heated imagination of a fiery bigot, or the ſpawn of an unnatural and unpardonable parricide.

As to the queſtion, " Whether, if the Legiſlature of Great Britain has now the Supremacy over the Colonies which it claims, it will not be equally entitled to it in any future time?" I anſwer, it will in all future times, and that nothing can deſtroy that title but ſuch an abuſe of it as would deſtroy the end for which it was inſtituted. This can be a queſtion with no body but thoſe who define right by power; who acknowledge the former no longer than it can be maintained by the latter, and I am ſorry to ſay, this is not the only ſpecimen this virtuous Advocate for Rebellion has given of his impartiality and candour. Suppoſe their number ten times as great as ours, and their power in proportion, will any one dare to ſay that number and power would deſtroy right? And if it would not, what does the Doctor's argument prove? Let them exceed us in all the arts and accompliſhments, which give dignity and happineſs to human life, I defy him to prove the poſſibility of their cancelling their obligation to their Prince, or to avoid bearing a fair and proportionable ſhare of the burthen of the State conſiſtently

conſiſtently with any rules of rectitude or juſtice. I truſt every candid man's mind will revolt at hearing number and power recommended as the *juſt* means of annihilating right. The queſtion ſhould be, if SUPREMACY is of right in the Britiſh Parliament *now*, what ſhould make it otherwiſe *then*. Conſtitutional right has drawn the line, let falſe Patriots and the enemies of Great Britain withdraw it if they can.

While Britain is the ſeat of Liberty and Virtue, and its Legiſlature conducts itſelf agreeably to the rights of the Conſtitution; it is the indiſpenſible duty of all its ſubjects to pay a juſt obedience to the Laws, and a loyal reſpect to the King. A proportionable ſhare of debts and taxes, and the neceſſary burthen of the State, ſhould be laid on every ſubject, whether he reſides in Aſia, America, or Europe, and every foot of land, and the whole of their property, are jointly bound with ours, to diſcharge the National Debt, and to bear and pay the intereſt, till the principal ſhall be paid of. But when our excellent conſtitution of Government may be ſubverted, and this free Government become arbitrary and tyrannical, agreeably to the Doctor's prophecy, at that ſad period it will neither be the duty of the Colonies,

nor of the ſubjects here to obey. Obedience is no longer due to Government, than it is conſtitutionally exerciſed. When the Legiſlature of a free country violates the rights of the Conſtitution, and acts tyrannically, the Government is diſſolved by itſelf, and every act being againſt law, is an act of violence, a State of nature then takes place, and the aggrieved have a natural right to repel force by force, and defend themſelves in the beſt manner they can. But is it not the very height of infatuation or madneſs to urge the neceſſity of rebellion in a free State, becauſe it is *poſſible* attempts may be made hereafter to inſlave it. Would you moſt iniquitouſly anticipate all the miſeries of anarchy and confuſion, and the utter ſubverſion and deſtruction of your country, becauſe Government cannot give you any *ſecurity* that ſuch a period ſhall never come? Yet theſe are the *unanſwerable* arguments which give countenance and ſanction to the preſent horrid rebellion.

If the Britiſh Legiſlature has the power it claims over the Legiſlations, and internal Rights of the Colonies, it never can ſubject them to the arbitrary power of the Crown. It never can ſubject them to any thing but what the conſtitution permits in common with

with all Britiſh ſubjects under ſimilar circumſtances. What *command* ſubjects have over Government, I do not underſtand. If the Doctor thinks abſolute monarchy is better than limited monarchy, many perſons, as he ſays, think otherwiſe; he might have ſaid *all*; muſt all then pay an implicit obedience to his judgment. If a Government by King, Lords, and Commons, is the perfection of Government, why do you rebel againſt that Government? If the Commons are not a juſt repreſentation of the people, who have the people to blame but the people for not chooſing ſuch who would juſtly repreſent them. If it is extended to a people over whom the Legiſlature has no juriſdiction, ſuch people are not bound by ſuch extenſion; but if they are ſubjects of Great Britain, they are equally bound with thoſe who reſide here, and are as effectually repreſented as their fellow ſubjects here, in every ſenſe of the word that can be warranted by law, cuſtom, or uſage, as has been clearly explained. If this is the *beſt*, and a Government by a King only muſt be the *worſt*, why then is the latter preferred, and cruelty and injuſtice transferred from him who prefers it to thoſe who who do not? No power is claimed that is repugnant to the rights of the conſtitution,

and

and the complaints of the exerciſe of power againſt rebels, is ſimilar to that of a robber who complains of the chains which deprive him of liberty and make him a ſlave. Our laws indeed go much further, they deprive men of their lives when they have juſtly forfeited them, and probably this will be the fate of many of the rebels, together with the loſs of their fortunes and eſtates, by which they will bring a curſe not only upon themſelves, but alſo upon their unhappy poſterity. By this means, indeed, Freemen may be degraded and debaſed into ſlaves, and how great will be their obligation, think you, to thoſe who have ſpirited them on to their utter ruin.

To talk of "particular bodies of men *within* the kingdom, who happen not to be repreſented," is nonſenſe, becauſe, as we have ſhewn, no ſuch men exiſt. The meaneſt ſubjects in Britain, even thoſe who have no property, are as effectually repreſented, and their lives and liberty equally protected as the firſt ſubjects in the realm. We have already ſhewn this falſe reaſoning is founded on the ſophiſtical conſtruction of the word Repreſentation, which cannot be defended on any ground which is reconcileable to reaſon, truth, equity, law, cuſtom or uſage, but,

but, on the contrary, is a ſenſe which is a direct violation of them all. Every ſubject, let his reſidence be in whatever part of the Globe you pleaſe, is equally repreſented in the Britiſh Parliament, and is equally the object of its protection, if it be within the ſphere of its power of action. It is alſo equally impoſſible that this Legiſlature ſhould ſubject either Britons or Americans to arbitrary power, becauſe they have no ſuch right; and therefore cannot have a power to exerciſe a right which has no exiſtence. But it is ſaid, "We know that it *has* been done." True, if the power of puniſhing rebels is arbitrary power, otherwiſe it *has not* been done.

SECTION II.

Whether the War with AMERICA *is juſtified by the Principles of the Conſtitution.*

THIS is the Title of the Doctor's ſecond Section, which he thinks he has anſwered in the negative. We think he has ſaid nothing to the purpoſe. "The eſſence of our conſtitution (ſays he) conſiſts in its independency." Independency on what, I pray? On all exterior power to which it has

has no relation or connexion; not on its ſeveral conſtituent parts, in the juſt union of which *depends* its political exiſtence. The eſſence of our conſtitution then conſiſts in a due equilibrium of its ſeveral component parts; and our Government is conſtitutionally exerciſed when each component part takes its proper ſhare of every action. To maintain the conſtitution of *America* as contradiſtinguiſhed from the conſtitution of *Great Britain*, is an abſurd propoſition; for they are not two diſtinct conſtitutions, or the conſtitutions of two independent States, but one individual conſtitution of a great Empire, branched out into ſeveral States, comprehending every ſubject and every thing that relates, or in any ſenſe belongs to it within the ſaid Empire. Is it poſſible to conceive a more ridiculous notion than that every State ſo branched forth ſhould have a diſtinct conſtitution of its own, independent of the conſtitution of the *parent* State, which pervades the whole Empire, of which all others are only conſtituent parts? Yet this, abſurd and impoſſible as it is, is the doctrine here maintained. Wherever then the Sovereignty of Great Britain is eſtabliſhed, there its conſtitution of Government is eſtabliſhed alſo; for the exiſtence of one neceſſarily implies the exiſtence of the other. They

are as neceſſary to political exiſtence, as ſoul and body are to human exiſtence; take away either, the political conſtitution is as much annihilated as the human. What is improperly called eſtabliſhing our own conſtitution of government in America, means no more than enforcing the conſtitutional rights of Government, to maintain that juſt obedience which it is the indiſpenſible duty of all its ſubjects to obſerve. A duty which Government itſelf *cannot* diſpenſe with, without a manifeſt violation of that moral rectitude which is the baſis on which the political principles of every free Government is founded. Principles by which the equity and juſtice of every act of legiſlation is to be examined, and its truth and merit aſcertained. What are the chartered Governments of America, then, with which they are pleaſed? Have they any that render them independent of the Legiſlature of Great Britain, any that abſolve them from its ſovereignty and right of dominion? Indeed I believe not; but if they had, ſuch Charters would ſo far be unconſtitutional, and of courſe void. A Granter, be his condition and ſtation whatever you pleaſe, cannot beſtow a greater right than he has to beſtow; he cannot give away the rights of others. If therefore any Colony had a Charter, by

which it is entitled to the protection of the Mother Country, and by which it is exempted from all taxation, and every burthen incident to Government, I ſay ſuch Charter is to all intents and purpoſes null and void. Becauſe it is repugnant to the common rights of all other ſubjects, therefore unconſtitutional and unlawful. For the right of Government is not to diſpenſe with the duty of one part of the people, and to lay the whole burthen upon another, if it ſhould ſo pleaſe; its duty is to maintain a juſt equilibrium between all its members and parts, which can be done only by juſtly proportioning every man's ſhare to his ability to bear it. And this is as much the indiſpenſible duty of Government to coerce, as it is of every individual ſubject to ſubmit to; a duty eſſential to every free Government, which makes reaſon, equity, and juſtice the rule of its conduct.

But the Colonies have no ſuch Charters; it is therefore arguing about the properties of non-entities, about nothing. If they had ſuch Charters, "which, if any Power on earth may change without their conſent, that Power may likewiſe, if it thinks proper, deliver them over to the Grand Seignor," is ſo far from being true, that it is a moſt palpable

palpable falſhood. For, if they had ſuch Charters, Government not only might, but it would be a duty incumbent on it to change them; the conſtitutional rights of *all* its other ſubjects demand it. But ſhould it deliver them over to any other Power, without their conſent, it would be an act deſtitute of right, conſequently arbitrary and tyrannical! Is it not amazing, that a profeſſed Advocate for Civil Liberty ſhould confound legitimate acts of power, the offſpring of right, reaſon, equity, and duty, with acts of violence, which are repugnant to every principle of humanity?

If the Colonies poſſeſs Governments which are of right independent of ours, whether they are perfectly the ſame, or perfectly different to ours, an attempt to ſubject them to ours would be an unjuſt attempt; it would be to make that dependent, which of right is and ought to remain independent: But does this prove that the Colonies of Great Britain are not its Colonies; that its ſovereignty does not extend thither; that the people of the Colonies, who are the ſubjects of Great Britain, are not the ſubjects of Great Britain; and that, though it has a right of dominion over them, and they are dependent upon it, yet they are perfectly

independent? If it proves not this, it proves nothing to the Doctor's purpoſe; and if it proves this, it proves contradictions and impoſſibilities.

The truth is, the Governments of the Colonies are all chartered, like the Governments of Corporations here. They may all poſſeſs privileges and immunities peculiar to themſelves, which of right cannot be taken from them, while they faithfully perform and keep the conditions on which they were granted. But would any one in his ſenſes call this an *independent* right, in oppoſition to, and in contempt of the Power from whence it originated, when its very exiſtence *depends* upon the performance of the conditions upon which it was granted? How futile it is, then, to call that a free Government, which is no Government at all in its own right, but which holds all its powers in ſubordination to that Government by which it was conſtituted, and to which it is, and muſt of right continue in ſubjection.

It ſeems clear to me, that "the eſſence of our Conſtitution," and "the fundamental principles of our Government," are pretty much the ſame thing. But the Doctor tells us,

the

the former conſiſts in its independency, the latter in " the right of a people to give and grant their own money." We have ſeen how little his reaſoning on the former has proved to his purpoſe, let us now examine the latter. Money may as properly be ſaid to be the ſinews of Government as of War, but if its ſupplies depended ſolely on the free donations of the people, as the words *give* and *grant* clearly imply, the wheels of Government would ſtand ſtock ſtill, for want of the neceſſary powers to put them in motion. The words *give* and *grant* are borrowed from an old law phraſe, and uſed in a ſenſe here which is contradicted by facts. That the people have a right to give and grant their own money for ſuch purpoſes as they pleaſe, is undoubtedly true; but that the money neceſſary for the ſupport of Government is the produce of that right voluntarily exerciſed, is notoriouſly falſe, as every one knows. The fundamental principle of our Government is, that no law can be made to bind the people, either in reſpect to money or any thing elſe, without the conſent of a majority of the Members who repreſent them. The act, or the right of giving and granting their own money, is no otherwiſe their act and their right, than is every other act of their Repreſentatives,

reſpect-

reſpecting every law that paſſes. The truth is, the right of levying ſupplies on the people for the neceſſary purpoſes of Government, is a right inherent in the Conſtitution, and inſeparable from it: A right ſo eſſential to Government, that it could not ſubſiſt without it. It therefore is neceſſarily lodged in the Conſtitution, and all acts reſpecting it of right are enforced by the Legiſlature. The principle on which our Government, as a free Government, is founded, then, is not "that no money can be levied upon them, but that all is their own voluntary gift;" but that no money can be taken from them by the other States of the Legiſlature, without the concurrence of their Repreſentatives.

"It was an attempt to violate this right that produced the Civil War in the reign of Charles the Firſt." Had the two Houſes of Parliament concurred with him, the act had not been his, and conſequently there could have been no violation of rights, becauſe the act would have been agreeable to the rights of the Conſtitution. But how does it follow, that acts of power, exerciſed agreeably to the rights of the Conſtitution, do not differ from acts of tyranny, exerciſed in oppoſition to, and in deſtruction of the

rights

rights of the Conſtitution. *Charles the Firſt* juſtly ſuffered for attempting to violate the rights and deſtroy the liberties of the ſubject, in contempt of the laws; and the preſent Government is equally *criminal*, we are deſired to believe, (and therefore we may reaſonably ſuppoſe are *juſtly* entitled to the ſame puniſhment,) in defending the rights of Great Britain in conformity to the laws. If the Americans are our brethren and fellow-ſubjects, do they not enjoy the rights that we ourſelves enjoy? If thoſe rights have in any ſenſe been neglected or ſuſpended, pray in whoſe favour has it been? In the Colonies, who reaped the advantages, or the Mother Country, who hath had the honour of bearing the whole expence of the Government who ſuſtained them? Can it, without the moſt corrupt and flagitious violation of decency and truth, be denied, that the Legiſlature hath given the King *our* money, by which we are become, on their account, many millions in debt, without giving him a ſingle ſhilling of *theirs*? The difference between the attempt made in the time of *Charles the Firſt*, to take away the right of the ſubject by *one man*, and the attempt made on the Americans by the Parliament, is only the trifling difference that there is between an avowed act of tyranny, in defi-

ance

ance of the laws, and the exerciſe of a conſtitutional right, to coerce a juſt obedience to the laws. The preſent war was undertaken to maintain the principles of the Conſtitution, and to compel the ſubjects of Great-Britain reſiding in America, to bear ſome part of the burthen of the State, in juſtice to its ſubjects here; to call it therefore a groſs and flagrant violation of the Conſtitution, is a moſt virulent Libel, made in defiance of Government, by a daring enemy to the Conſtitution.

SECTION III.

Of the POLICY *of the* WAR *with* AMERICA.

THE ſubject of this ſection is indeed of very great importance. I defy any man, whoſe mind is but faintly impreſſed with ideas of Candour and Equity, to read it without feelings of averſion and contempt. Every ſentence ſhews a predetermination in favour of America, and every meaſure of Great-Britain is ſtigmatized with folly and iniquity.

Having ſaid a great deal about Reaſon, Juſtice, the Principles of Liberty, and the Rights

Rights of Humanity, much to the diſadvantage of his own cauſe, he ſeems quite at a loſs to know to what end and purpoſe a ſupremacy over the Colonies is to be maintained; and being unwilling to find any good end, declares there is no end, but what is diſhonourable and ruinous both to ourſelves and to them.

Hitherto I have followed the Doctor pretty cloſely, and have anſwered him almoſt line by line; but as I find him grow more uncandid and diſingenuous, in proportion as he advances, I have neither time nor inclination to follow him through all his ſophiſtical windings and doublings; I ſhall not therefore trouble the Reader with any thing that is not material to the main purpoſe.

That a ſupremacy over the Colonies ſhould be aſſerted by Great-Britain, independent of right, and without any proſpect of advantage, through a mere luſt of power, is a notion that no one could entertain whoſe mind is not darkened by inveterate prejudice, and his affections unnaturally eſtranged from his native country. Indeed it is too manifeſt, that in this enquiry little regard has been had to Truth, Right, Equity, or

ance of the laws, and the exerciſe of a conſtitutional right, to coerce a juſt obedience to the laws. The preſent war was undertaken to maintain the principles of the Conſtitution, and to compel the ſubjects of Great-Britain reſiding in America, to bear ſome part of the burthen of the State, in juſtice to its ſubjects here; to call it therefore a groſs and flagrant violation of the Conſtitution, is a moſt virulent Libel, made in defiance of Government, by a daring enemy to the Conſtitution.

SECTION III.

Of the POLICY *of the* WAR *with* AMERICA.

THE ſubject of this ſection is indeed of very great importance. I defy any man, whoſe mind is but faintly impreſſed with ideas of Candour and Equity, to read it without feelings of averſion and contempt. Every ſentence ſhews a predetermination in favour of America, and every meaſure of Great-Britain is ſtigmatized with folly and iniquity.

Having ſaid a great deal about Reaſon, Juſtice, the Principles of Liberty, and the

Rights

Rights of Humanity, much to the diſadvantage of his own cauſe, he ſeems quite at a loſs to know to what end and purpoſe a ſupremacy over the Colonies is to be maintained; and being unwilling to find any good end, declares there is no end, but what is diſhonourable and ruinous both to ourſelves and to them.

Hitherto I have followed the Doctor pretty cloſely, and have anſwered him almoſt line by line; but as I find him grow more uncandid and diſingenuous, in proportion as he advances, I have neither time nor inclination to follow him through all his ſophiſtical windings and doublings; I ſhall not therefore trouble the Reader with any thing that is not material to the main purpoſe.

That a ſupremacy over the Colonies ſhould be aſſerted by Great-Britain, independent of right, and without any proſpect of advantage, through a mere luſt of power, is a notion that no one could entertain whoſe mind is not darkened by inveterate prejudice, and his affections unnaturally eſtranged from his native country. Indeed it is too manifeſt, that in this enquiry little regard has been had to Truth, Right, Equity, or

Juſtice, but every means has been uſed to inflame the minds of thoſe who rank as enemies of the State, with little or no regard to either. How falſe, how fooliſh is the aſſertion, that the object of the war is the extenſion of dominion. In what ſenſe can dominion be ſaid to be extended, the extent of which has been eſtabliſhed an age? The object of the war is to aſſert the right of Government, to enforce the obedience, and ſubdue the Rebellion of ungrateful and diſloyal ſubjects. It is the ſame object every Government has in view, for if the ſubject has a right to be his own Legiſlator, and act as he will, and to violate the laws of the State with impunity, Civil Liberty and Government in ſuch a State has no meaning. It is a me e ſtate of nature, in which Government has no real exiſtence. Can power be ſaid to be wantonly exerciſed, and to become tyrannical, which is exerciſed only to enforce obedience to the laws, to maintain peace and good order, and to ſecure the ſafety of the people, and the juſt authority of the State. Where no regard is had to *right*, there no remedy remains but *power*; if our power is not ſufficient to maintain our right, by the principles of the Doctor, and the intentions of the Coloniſts, we muſt ſubmit to loſe it. What is the end of prreſerving

ſerving power, if the uſe of it is denied when *moſt* neceſſary. Men who are deaf to reaſon, and dead to all ſenſe of right and equity, *muſt* be reclaimed by *force*, or remain as unjuſt in practice as unreaſonable in principle.

If "there is a love of power inherent in human nature," is it not equally ſo in America as in Europe; or do thoſe immaculate friends of the Doctor poſſeſs all the virtues, and none of the frailties of human nature. Is not pride, and the luſt of power, as prevailing there as here? There is this ſtriking difference however, here it is exerted to maintain equity and juſtice between ſubject and ſubject, there to circumvent and deſtroy it. Can any thing be more ridiculous than to aſcribe *that* to the luſt of power, and the flattering ſenſations of looking acroſs the *Atlantic*, and viewing increaſing MILLIONS whom we conſider as OUR ſubjects, which is truly an equitable meaſure, founded in reaſon and truth, and calculated to put *all* the ſubjects of Great Britain upon a juſt and equal footing. Was the humility of Chriſtians infuſed in our hearts, as the Doctor deſires, having taken our coats, we might give them our cloaks alſo, and go naked, for they no longer deſire

to be related to us than they can profit by us.

Whatever may have been ſaid by our Miniſters, that a Revenue ſhould be drawn from *America* is certainly an object founded in equity and juſtice. And if it is always to be ſupported and defended at the ſole expence of Great Britain, it were better to break off the connexion. In that caſe, Dean *Tucker*'s plan would be the beſt beyond all compariſon. What may be the conſequence of the War, is very uncertain, but ſhould the rebels be defeated, would that depopulate the country, or render it unfertile? The eſtates of rebels become prolific in the tenure of loyal ſubjects, and perhaps the far greater part of the people wiſh for nothing better than maternal protection upon the terms offered. Is it poſſible to conceive a miſrepreſentation of facts, or aſperſions more malignant and falſe than the accuſation of "ſheathing our ſwords in the bowels of our brethren, and ſpreading miſery and ruin among a happy people, for no other end than to oblige them to acknowledge our ſupremacy." How horridly falſe! How contemptibly baſe! What can equal the effrontery of comparing the mild and virtuous temper, the humane diſpoſition,

and

and remarkable love of juſtice of our illuſtrious SOVEREIGN, to the curſed ambition of a *Cæſar*, and an *Alexander*, and other mad Conquerors? What can equal the helliſh falſhood, that the King of Great Britain, in puniſhing Rebels, is actuated by ſimilar motives, to the mad Heroes of antiquity, who attacked peaceful communities to ſatiate the luſt of power, to gratify ambition, to extend dominion, and to lay waſte the earth?

What follows is a vile miſrepreſentation of facts. Truth is ſuppreſſed, imagination has ſupplied its place, and the pious Doctor has run a *whoring* after his own inventions. How abſurd it is to talk of "one people maintaining authority over another, already happy in the enjoyment of a Government of their own." They never had a Government of their own independent of Britain. If the means of promoting ſome end, and doing ſome good, can warrant the exertion of authority, then the preſent meaſures of Britain are fully juſtified. Its ſubjects have long ſuſtained a heavy burthen, brought upon them by ſuccouring and protecting the Coloniſts; they now demand, upon principles of equity and juſtice, that the Coloniſts, as fellow ſubjects, ſhould bear a proportionable ſhare of that burthen in common with themſelves.

ſelves. This is a requiſition too juſt and reaſonable for Government not to comply with; a requiſition ſo ſelf-evidently juſt, that he, whoſoever he be, who oppoſes it, is an *enemy* to truth, to rectitude, to equity and juſtice, and to every principle of humanity neceſſary to cement the friendſhip, and preſerve the peace and tranquillity of ſociety.

As to this performance of the Doctor's, it is a moſt virulent and ſcandalous *libel* on the Conſtitution, on the King and Government, and on Civil Liberty. It is an inſult on the reaſon and underſtanding of man. An attempt to cram his own indigeſted prejudices, and dreaming reveries, down the throats of the people, for inherent rights and unalienable properties, which Britain is now endeavouring, by the moſt atrocious means, to rob the Americans of. It is a ſlander upon human nature, and every thing valuable belonging to it, the pure, undefiled, praying, faſting Saints of America only excepted.

'Tis ſaid, " it is undeniable, that America has been one of the main ſprings of our opulence and ſplendour, and that we have, in a great meaſure, been indebted to it for our ability to bear a debt ſo much heavier

heavier than that which, fifty years ago, the wiſeſt men thought would neceſſarily ſink us." Is it not much more evident, that, in that ſpace of time, the debt has been increaſed to three times the bulk it was then, and to twice the amount it was at the beginning of the laſt war, and that chiefly in protecting them. Now who have been the gainers? If the opulence of a people may be judged of by the meaſure of their conſumption, in the ſpace of time above-mentioned, it increaſed in *Pennſylvania* from 16,000l. to half a million, and in little more than half the time, in all the Colonies, from 640,114l. to three millions, according to the Doctor's own account; on the other hand, Britain, which, according to him, has been ſo amazingly benefited by them, has, in a third of the time, added the amazing ſum of ſeventy millions to the debt, that is, in that ſhort ſpace, has doubled it, and that principally on their account. Was there ever a greater ſoleciſm in common ſenſe, than that a country ſhould owe its opulence and ſplendour to thoſe who have increaſed its debt beyond its power to bear it? or that a country ſhould be enabled to bear its burthens, by thoſe who have ſo immenſely added to its weight, as we are told *muſt* infallibly ruin it? What a

flagrant

flagrant inconſiſtency it is to deſcribe America as having laboured to enrich and ſupport Great-Britain, in oppoſition to the purſuits of a general commerce which would have been advantageous to them, when the conſequence has been ſuch an accumulation of wealth and power to them, accompanied with ingratitude and injuſtice, as to make them rebel againſt the Parent State, from which they derived their exiſtence; the State which has cheriſhed and ſupported them from their original ſtate of infancy, at an amazing expence of blood and treaſure; and now the requiſition of a moderate contribution towards the ſupport of Government is treated as an attempt to rob them of their property, and to inſlave them. Human nature revolts at ſo uncandid, at ſo unjuſt a charge.

But it is ſaid, the Colonies conſiſt of a number of States, every one of which are likely to become ſoon ſuperior to Britain in opulence and power; and this is urged as a reaſon for cancelling all right of dominion Britain has in America. I wonder the advocates of ſuch a cauſe dare to talk of equity, juſtice, or any thing that relates to rectitude, and moral obligation. Does an increaſe of opulence and power deſtroy

right,

right, and does obligation ceaſe, when power is too weak to enforce it?

The Doctor has ſaid a great deal about *Specie* and *Paper*, and he may underſtand their real and relative nature well, but I dare not take his account of them upon truſt, becauſe, in the former part of his Book, he has adopted common-place invective for indiſputable principles, and the phraſeology of the mob, for the political doctrine of the State. What advantages he may reap from his new-acquired character of a ſubtle diſputant, I am unable to ſay; but if they are not great indeed, he will be a ſufferer, becauſe he has forfeited all pretenſions to the Man of Candour, Veracity, and Loyalty, to encourage Rebellion, and bring a Curſe upon his country.

His account of the quantity of ſpecie in the kingdom is perfectly imaginary. It may be only fifteen millions, or it may be thirty. I will venture to ſay, he knows not whether. "Of this ſeveral millions muſt be hoarded in the *Bank*." What does he mean by *ſeveral*, two, or twenty? Here again his imagination is the oracle. "Our circulating *ſpecie*, therefore, appears to be greatly decreaſed." How does it *ap-*

pear to be greatly decreaſed? Not from what he has ſaid, for, if that be true, the contrary *appears*. "At the Revolution (it ſeems) the *ſpecie* of the kingdom amounted to eighteen millions and a half," ſince, twenty-nine millions of gold, and half a million of ſilver, were coined, which together make forty-eight millions; now if only fourteen remain, I wiſh this holy Prophet would tell us what is become of the other. It will be readily granted, that, as we dig no ſilver nor gold here, all we coin muſt come from abroad; not as a preſent, but for a valuable conſideration; or, if you pleaſe, to diſcharge the balance of trade. If the balance of trade was againſt us, as ſome imagine, our *ſpecie* would continually decreaſe, till we had none left. But this account, if true, ſerves to prove, that the balance of trade is greatly in our favour. Have we really then nearly fifty millions of ſpecie in circulation? If not, what is become of the ſum deficient? Indeed I believe not; the laſt war, in defence of America, has diſburthened us. How kind and gracious it was in our brethren there to relieve us from the weight of ſo great a burthen! and how generous, patriotic, and juſt in the Doctor, to labour to convince them that reſtitution is robbery,

bery, and ſubmiſſion ſlavery! How are our manners changed! Such virtues, in former days, were rewarded with a halter. Curſe on his virtues, they are meant to undo his country!

"But our wealth is greatly increaſed. This is Paper, to a vaſt amount, iſſued particularly by the BANK OF ENGLAND. While this Paper maintains its credit, it anſwers all the purpoſes of ſpecie," &c. The BANK, and its CREDIT, are obſtructions to the completion of the tremendous prophecy, therefore every expedient is uſed to ruin them, to accelerate the laſt dreadful cataſtrophe, the ruin of this country. "While this *paper* maintains its *credit*," *ſpecie* is unneceſſary; credit muſt therefore be deſtroyed, or ruin cannot ſucceed. How glorioufly patriotic it is to labour ſo indefatigably to deſtroy this *credit!* "But it is natural to enquire how the currency of this *paper* is ſupported? The anſwer is eaſy; it is ſupported in the ſame manner with all other *bubbles*."—The BANK, and its CREDIT, then are BUBBLES, and its DIRECTORS, in concert with GOVERNMENT, I ſuppoſe, are the BUBBLERS, who are *bubbling* the nation into ruin.

If I miſtake not, it is now about four years ſince the Doctor began to publiſh his prophetic feelings for the ſafety of this country. He rang his alarm-bell then concerning the dangerous ſubverſion of the ſinking fund, and the certain ruin of the nation. This had its effects upon numbers who held an implicit belief in the reveries of the Doctor, rather than be at the trouble of thinking for themſelves. A meeting was propoſed at the *King's Arms Tavern*, to open a ſubſcription, and enter into a Confederacy againſt nobody knew what, unleſs it was Government and Ruin. But the Doctor's ſchemes having been examined by other Writers, and it being demonſtrated that they could only ſerve to accelerate, and render certain the ruin he at moſt only proved poſſible, the meeting was laid aſide, reaſon began to operate, confidence and quieſcence reſumed its ſeat, and peace was reſtored. The Doctor, however, did not experience this ſtate of tranquillity; the ſeeds of his diſorder were locked up in his heart, like a fire concentrated, ready to burſt forth the firſt opportunity with greater violence. At length the dangerous *paroxyſm* is returned, and the Doctor raves with all the vehemence of political enthuſiaſm.

Specie

Specie repreſents real value in goods or commodities neither mediately nor immediately, any more than BANK PAPER. The currency both of the one and the other depends upon the opinion of him who receives it. Neither of them is properly a repreſentation of the value of goods, nor has any thing intrinſic in them that is equivalent thereto. The relation both of one and the other to the value of goods and to each other, is perfectly arbitrary, was eſtabliſhed by cuſtom, and continues by general conſent, and be the circumſtance of ſpecie whatever it may, it can never injure the credit of the Bank materially, while the people of fortune and character determine to ſupport it. Paper, therefore, repreſents real value as much as coin, and is equally a ſign of wealth, or, as the Doctor himſelf expreſſed it but a few lines before, is itſelf *wealth*. "Coin indeed is an *univerſal* ſign of wealth;" that is where ſuch coin is current, and that for the moſt part is only in the country where it is coined. Our money in moſt parts of Europe is no more current than our Bank paper, and we all remember when Portugal Gold loſt its currency here, and would no longer paſs among us. Even at this moment ninety-nine perſons out of a hundred would refuſe to take a quarter of a guinea, and

Wood's

Wood's Iriſh halfpence, and Welch harps paſs currently, while the coin of George the Third, of more than three times their intrinſick value, is *abſolutely* refuſed. Coin therefore depends upon opinion for its currency as much as paper, and it is equally local, and, like other commodities, its value is aſcertainable only by the market.

But it is ſaid, " Paper can ſtand no ſhock. It is deſtroyed by the approach of danger; or even the *ſuſpicion* of danger." This is mere aſſertion, and has been often *happily* contradicted by facts. Wicked men, the avowed *enemies* of their country, may inflame the minds of the diſaffected, propagate fear, apprehenſions, and deſpondency in the minds of the timorous and weak, and excite tumults and commotions in a mob; but let the people of property join in defending the *Credit* of the Bank, and the Rights of the Conſtitution, the Doctor and the Devil may then do their worſt, for all the powers of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt them. If half the pains had been taken to depreciate any part of our ſpecie that has been uſed to deſtroy the Credit of the Bank, together with that of the State, its currency would for a time have been totally deſtroyed. The patriotic virtues of the Doctor therefore richly entitle

entitle him to the warmeſt and moſt grateful returns of the State, the Bank, and the People.

"Were our coin all deſtroyed, or the quantity of it reduced beyond a certain limit," great difficulty and deſpondency would follow, and be ſeverely felt; but it would laſt no longer than the people of property ſhould mutually agree and conſent to accept of Bank paper, in full ſatisfaction for every demand whatever, in the ſame manner that is now practiſed. The difficulty would immediately vaniſh, and buſineſs go on with the ſame eaſe and ſatisfaction as before. Why ſhould it not? If a piece of paper would procure as much meat, drink, cloaths, and goods of any ſort, as ten, fifty, or a hundred pieces of metal, it would be juſt as uſeful, and anſwer every purpoſe equally well. But it is ſaid, "were our paper deſtroyed the coin would not only remain, but riſe in value," &c. Pray, how does it appear that the coin would remain? Would the Doctor communicate the infallible means of effecting this, it would be worth all he ever wrote, if he means any thing different from conducting our foreign trade in ſuch manner as that the balance ſhall be always in our favour. In that caſe the caſh would

would not only remain but increaſe; as on the other hand, if the balance was againſt us it would not remain, but decreaſe the full amount of the balance we might have to pay. And thus would it conſtantly happen, whether our paper were deſtroyed either in the whole or in part, or were continually increaſing.

It however by no means follows, "that as far as ſpecie is not to be procured in exchange for paper, it repreſents *nothing*, and is worth *nothing*." This is ſo far from being true, that in all circumſtances where ſpecie is not to be got, Paper ſupplies its room, and anſwers every purpoſe. It always repreſents the value of the thing for which it is exchanged, which is all that ſpecie can do; how then can it be ſaid to be worth nothing? "Were all to demand ſpecie in exchange for their notes, payment could not be made," &c. This may be very true, and perhaps the ſame thing may be ſaid with equal truth of the moſt opulent perſons in the kingdom. But what is the uſe of this obſervation, but to alarm the fears of the weak, to excite a run upon the Bank, and if poſſible to deſtroy its credit. Horrid attempt! as fooliſh as flagitious. Why ſhould all demand ſpecie in exchange for their

their notes, to make an experiment which every one already knows the reſult of? Who was ever ſo fooliſh as to ſuppoſe dealers in money keep as much by them as they owe? And if they do not, if all ſhould be demanded payment could not be made. What then? Does it follow they are ſupported in the ſame manner with all other bubbles; that the whole frame of Government would fall to pieces, and a ſtate of nature take place? A moſt abſurd and infernal hope. This argument ſuppoſes what the weakeſt of mankind never ſuppoſed: It ſuppoſes the ſpecie of the kingdom is the whole worth of the kingdom; otherwiſe how does it appear, that if the ſpecie be not ſufficient to diſcharge the debts, all muſt go to wreck, and a ſtate of nature take place. One may owe a hundred thouſand pounds, he may be worth but ten thouſand, and may have only one thouſand in ſpecie, which may be quite ſufficient for his purpoſe in the regular courſe of his buſineſs, and characteriſe him a good man. But ſhould a run be made upon him, 'tis plain enough, one thouſand would not diſcharge a hundred thouſand. What would this prove? Not that he was not a good man, and able to pay; but that his creditors were headſtrong, and fooliſh, and were reſolved to ruin him

they knew not why nor wherefore. Juſt ſo do thoſe officious perſons act who are fond of ſhewing their wiſdom, and care, by their conſtant addreſs to the fears of the people; they warn them of their danger, and uſe every nefarious means to render it certain and ſpeedy, that they may eſtabliſh their credit as men of ſuperior diſcernment. A political Quack, like a phyſical one, who foretels the death of his patient, may take care to poiſon him for the credit of his prognoſtick.

Our preſent debt is near one hundred and forty millions. A moſt enormous ſum! May ſome effectual method be ſpeedily put in practice to reduce it. But becauſe the current ſpecie is ſuppoſed to be ſcarcely equal in amount to the money now drawn from the public by the taxes, let it not be thought that the *State* and the *Bank*, on the credit of which both are ſaid to depend, muſt neceſſarily become Bankrupts. This has been held up *in terrorem*, not as being neceſſary to appriſe and warn of danger, but to create diffidence and fear, and propagate danger.—If King William's wars drained the kingdom of its ſpecie, and this ſunk the Revenue, and diſtreſſed Government, and if the eſtabliſhment of the BANK, provided

a remedy

a remedy for this evil and relieved Government, as the Doctor ſays, with what heart can he reprobate thoſe who have been the SAVIOURS of his Country? However, the national debt, great and afflicting as it is, I hope and believe is much better ſecured to its Creditors, than the enemies of Government would have it thought. The whole of the lands, properties, and effects of all the people of Great Britain are ſubject to the payment of this debt. It is the whole of the people who pay the intereſt, and they are equally bound to pay the principal. In the whole of the people I include our rebellious brethren in America, who poſſeſs not a foot of land, nor the leaſt property, but what in juſtice, equity, and truth, is bound to bear its proportion in the diſcharge of the national debt.

"Our danger is created chiefly by the national debt." The moſt natural, and the moſt effectual method of avoiding the danger is to pay it off. But this we are unable to do. "High taxes are therefore neceſſary to ſupport it, and a large ſupply of caſh is neceſſary to ſupport high taxes. This caſh we owe to our paper; and in proportion to our paper, muſt be the productiveneſs of our taxes." If this be true (as the Doctor

maintains) how abſurd it is to endeavour to deſtroy the very means upon which we depend for our preſent ſupport and ſalvation! Government cannot be ſupported, and the intereſt of the national debt paid otherwiſe than by taxes, and if the productiveneſs of our taxes is in proportion to the amount of our paper, is it not madneſs in the extreme to endeavour to deſtroy its credit, by making the world believe it is no more than a bubble. But it is as falſe as it is malevolent, for it is evident the whole kingdom and all the property in it are ſecurities for its payment. If groundleſs events ſhould deſtroy the credit and uſe of paper, we ſhould have nothing to blame but our own folly. If French Troops, or inteſtine Inſurrections ſhould create a revolution in Government, would ſpecie be ſafer than paper? Would not houſes, and land, and property of every kind change their owners, and paſs from the conquered, to the Conquerors? An earthquake may ſwallow up the whole Iſland, and every thing upon it; and the general conflagration may come and burn all to a cinder. Theſe are evils that *may* happen, evils that no one can prevent. However, the Doctor, through the violence of his apprehenſions, may cry, *Fire, Fire,* till he has alarmed the whole nation, tho' no one can diſcern

the

the flame or feel its heat.—If " there is nothing that a Government may not do with ſuch a mine at its command as a public Bank, while it can maintain its credit," is it not the duty of every ſubject of ſuch Government, to uſe his beſt endeavours to maintain that credit? And what of right is the due of that ſubject, who exerts all his abilities to deſtroy it? I ſhould be happy to learn this book of the Doctor's has any other tendency than to eſtrange the affections of the people from Government, and to deſtroy that confidence in the Bank, which he himſelf maintains is neceſſary to the ſupport of Government. If the whole is a Bubble, and all he has ſaid about it is true, and every thing is working towards general devaſtation and unavoidable ruin; for God's ſake why all this ſolicitude to plunge us into it to-morrow, leſt it ſhould not happen for a hundred years to come. It certainly is the duty of every ſubject, I am ſure it is the earneſt deſire of every *honeſt* man, to maintain and defend that credit, upon which the peace, proſperity, and ſafety of *all* depend.

"An unfavourable balance of trade" would infallibly leſſen our ſpecie, and raiſe the price of bullion; prudence ſhould therefore

fore direct us to keep the balance in our favour. But how the new coinage of the gold ſpecie has increaſed its exportation, is not accounted for. The balance of trade by no means depends upon the weight of our ſpecie; if it be againſt us, it muſt be paid, either in coin or bullion. This is at the choice of the remitter, and is ever determined by his intereſt; but it makes no difference to the public except the expence of coining. Before the new coinage, if the balance of trade was againſt us, that balance muſt have been paid. If the price of bullion was higher than what was equivalent to the coin, light as it was, nothing could prevent its being melted down, either for exportation, or being worked up here. The balance *muſt* be paid, neither the high price of bullion, nor our coin being too light, could prevent it. Keep the balance of trade in our favour, and the Doctor's fears of melting down in ſuch great quantities, and exporting ſo faſt as to leave none behind, will have no foundation: On the other hand, if the balance be againſt us, it muſt be paid either in bullion or coin, and 'tis not in the power of man to prevent it. Mr. LOWNDES's and Mr. CONDUIT's arguments are nothing to the Doctor's purpoſe. If there was no paper credit to bring money to the

Merchants

Merchants to be exported, if the balance be againſt them, they muſt get it by ſome other means, or loſe their credit. If the Doctor would uſe his endeavours to diſſuade the people from the immoderate uſe of foreign commodities, or contrive ſumptuary laws that might diminiſh their conſumption, ſo as to render the balance of trade greatly in our favour, he would merit that eſteem which he is now ſo anxious to forfeit; bullion would be conſtantly flowing in, ſpecie multiplying, and paper would be no further circulated than its convenience and real uſefulneſs in matters of trade and negotiation might render deſirable; for which purpoſes, every one, whoſe knowledge is derived from practice, cannot doubt but it is infinitely preferable to caſh, and in no ſenſe, that I can conceive, has the leaſt tendency to leſſen its quantity.

It is, however, exceeding difficult, if not impoſſible, ſo to adjuſt and proportion the weight of coin to the value of bullion, as to prevent crafty and deſigning men from making private advantages from public loſs. The weight of coin ſhould be ſuch as to make bullion, when at a medium price, more deſirable than coin for exportation, or melting down. Perhaps the preſent weight

of

of our coin is too great for this purpoſe, but with reſpect to this alſo, paper is entirely out of the queſtion. Many were too deeply impreſt by the cauſes which produced the change that happened in 1772, ever to forget it. I hope, however, the ſtate of things that took place before that year, will never more return, though the Doctor does not doubt it. Had the Bank adopted the ſame meaſures twelve or fourteen years before they did in that memorable year, they had ſaved many an honeſt man, and his family, from ruin.

A War, half as expenſive as the laſt, would probably occaſion infinite difficulties, perhaps conſequences more to be dreaded than difficulties; but I hope and believe the Doctor is greatly miſtaken, in aſſerting, that "the war with *America* has a greater tendency to do this;" and his reaſon, "that it affects our reſources more," is the child of his own imagination only. That the *North American* trade has enriched many of the Merchants and Manufacturers, I *know* to be true; I hope many thouſands have been great gainers; but neither this, nor the amount of that trade, nor the proportion it bears to all the reſt, is any thing to the Doctor's argument. Particular claſſes of men

men may profit by a trade that is ruinous to the public. I am firmly perſuaded Britain, in a national ſenſe, is to this hour far from being any gainer; its hopes of advantage were placed on times to come. Every man's judgment is liable to err, but he who ſtudiouſly and knowingly uſes falſe arguments to deceive and miſlead, ſtands in the ſame point of view, in my eye, as he who ſurreptitiouſly introduces articles in his account, and produces falſe vouchers, to throw the balance on the wrong ſide. The following obſervation will explain my meaning. — Speaking of our trade with America, p. 85, "In the article of *Tobacco* alone, it will cauſe a deduction from the *Cuſtoms* of at leaſt 300,000l. per annum, including the duties paid on foreign commodities purchaſed by the exportation of tobacco." Would not any one imagine, from hence, that the revenue ariſing from tobacco is at leaſt 300,000l. per annum? Caſt your eye on the note (*b*) in the ſame page, and there you will find, that above "four-fifths of the tobacco imported, is afterwards exported to *France*, *Germany*, and other countries." Now this is virtually refuting what had been juſt before aſſerted; for, the *Cuſtoms* paid on importation, are every farthing drawn back on *exportation*; therefore of the 300,000l.

increaſed to 500,000l. no more remains than 60,000l. which is, with great modeſty, called half a million. This 60,000l. is paid by the conſumers here. It is undoubtedly an article of luxury, though none of the *cleanlieſt*, it muſt be confeſſed. From hence it ſeems to appear, that the revenue ſuffers 60,000l. per annum. But what do the people ſave who uſed to pay it? Full four times that ſum; we will ſay 250,000l. Can it be doubted then, whether the people who ſave (which is equal to gaining) 250,000l. cannot, with great eaſe, pay double the ſum they uſed to pay, in ſome other way, which doubles that branch of the revenue, and leaves, in that ſingle article, a ſaving of 130,000l. *per annum* to the people.

From hence it appears, how falſe and dangerous is that maxim of MANDEVILLE's, "*that private vices are public benefits*;" upon which this reaſoning is founded. The ſame obſervation holds true in reſpect to deductions made from the produce of the Exciſes, and retrenchments of Luxury of every kind. Suppoſe by ſumptuary laws the people were reſtrained from the uſe of tea, ſpirituous liquors, (in which I include every thing which has ſtrength enough to intox-

intoxicate,) and many other things, made deſireable only through ill habit; the revenue would ſuffer in thoſe articles amazingly; but what would the people gain? Sums ſufficient to enable them to pay double thoſe the revenue might loſe by ſtriking off the ſeveral articles mentioned. There are thoſe who imagine hard labour is not to be performed without ſtrong liquor; this is a belief founded in ignorance, and is daily contradicted by facts. Some of the moſt robuſt, hardieſt, and moſt labouring people we have, ſeldom drink any thing better than ſmall beer, and that often but very indifferent, and thouſands not often any thing but water; yet they are chearful, healthy, and happy. They maintain themſelves and families better, are cleaner, healthier, and happier than others who earn ſix times as much, by employments far leſs laborious and toilſome. I have known many whoſe weekly earnings, upon an average, never reached ſeven ſhillings, who have brought up families of three, four, or five children, in a clean, decent, reputable manner, without any aſſiſtance whatever. I have known many in London who earned from thirty ſhillings to fifty a week, who had ſeldom a whole ſhoe to their feet, or a ſhirt to change them, but were forced to go without any

while it was waſhed; and their children in a manner ſtarving. I imagine theſe people do not pay leſs to the revenue than from four to ten ſhillings a week, while the former ſcarce pay ſo many ſhillings in a year. Muſt we therefore conclude luxury is a bleſſing, and the greateſt ſot the beſt ſubject, or can any proof be wanted, that he who ſpends little on exciſeable commodities, would be able to give double the aſſiſtance to the State with unſpeakable advantage to himſelf. Keep the people ſober, frugal, and virtuous, the Government will then never want good ſubjects, nor an adequate revenue to ſupport itſelf.

Should the reader conclude from hence, the writer is an enemy to the poor, he never embraced a more egregious error. An induſtrious man has not a more ſincere well-wiſher. Was his power equal to his inclination, the induſtrious would never know want, nor be acquainted with ſorrow. He has had abundant opportunity of making obſervations on the different conditions of men, and is well ſatisfied, that the evils of life are for the moſt part the manufacture of him who ſuffers. Let any man examine his own heart with impartiality, and I ſhall be much deceived, if his hard fortune is not

the

the genuine effects of his folly or his vices. He is a contemptible and ſhameful politician, who thinks luxury neceſſary to ſupport Government. Nothing is ſo pernicious and deſtructive to the people, and what injures them muſt finally weaken Government, and render it precarious and contemptible.

SECTION IV.

Of the HONOUR *of the* NATION, *as affected by the* WAR *with* AMERICA.

WITH the laſt Section I might ſatisfactorily have cloſed. What follows is moſtly common place invective, and licentious aſperſion. If by the people is meant the individuals who compoſe the people, their will is nothing certain, therefore cannot be known, nor carried into execution. But if by the will of the people is meant the will of a majority of thoſe who repreſent them, then nothing is carried into execution but what is agreeable to their will. Indeed it often happens, the meaſures of Government are oppoſed by the enemies of Government to the injury of the people. Oppoſition is not merit, often it is the ſad reverſe of merit. The will of the people is

to

to be carried into execution; but if the will of the people is againſt receding, then it is not to be carried into execution. "RECTITUDE IS DIGNITY. OPPRESSION ONLY IS MEANNESS; and JUSTICE, HONOUR." He that ſaid this, ſpoke well; but he who maintains that Rebellion is Rectitude, Law Oppreſſion, and Anarchy and Licentiouſneſs Inherent Right, perverts and abuſes language moſt ſhamefully. To follow the Author through this abuſive Section would be a moſt diſagreeable taſk. Suffice it then to ſay, it is a *ſcandalous Libel* on the Government, Laws, Conſtitution, Spirit, and Affections of his Country. He charges it with being an enemy to liberty, endeavouring to inſlave its own brethren, robbing them of their property, leaving them nothing they could call their own, and carrying deſolation and death among them for diſputing it. Was there ever any thing ſo falſe or inflammatory? All this muſt ſuppoſe the King of Great Britain has no dominion in America, that he is an Uſurper, and has hitherto robbed the Coloniſts. If this be not the fundamental principle on which this pretended ſcene of robbery is grounded, the whole is falſe and dangerous declamation, calculated to inflame the people, and propagate ſedition.

"The

"The GENOESE CEDED the CORSICANS to the FRENCH; if our claims are juſt, may not we alſo CEDE the Colonies to the *French?*" No, we could not, becauſe it would be repugnant to the rights of the ſubject, and the frame of the conſtitution. This is juſt the ſame as aſking, If we have a right to act in conformity to the laws for the protection of liberty, we have not an equal right to act in contempt of the laws for its deſtruction? But this requires ſome further conſideration. "The *Corſicans* had been ſubject to the *Genoeſe*." That ſubjection was founded in *right*, and their obedience was due to that State, or it was not. If it was, the *Corſicans* then were the aggreſſors, and the *Genoeſe* had a right to puniſh them in any manner that was agreeable to the conſtitution of that State. If the keeping them dutiful and obedient to the State, was found too difficult for them to perform with advantage, in that caſe they had a right to *cede* them to any Power they choſe; that is, they had a right to diſpoſe of all the intereſt they had in them as ſubjects of that State. Such a *Ceſſion* would not be a wanton exerciſe of power, void of right, but a puniſhment inflicted on rebellious ſubjects, for the ſatisfaction and recompence of the injured State. On the

other

other hand, if the *Genoeſe* had no right to the ſubjection of the *Corſicans*, the ceſſion of them to the *French* was an iniquitous exerciſe of power, and they had a right to refuſe ſubjection, and to defend themſelves to the utmoſt.

I am not ſufficiently informed to be able to judge on which ſide of this queſtion right exiſts; but if the caſe of the *Corſicans* is ſimilar to that of the *Americans*, except in not being deſcended from the *Genoeſe*, then the right is clearly determined in favour of the latter, unleſs any one can be ſo unreaſonable as to maintain, that Government has no right to puniſh its ſubjects who tranſgreſs its laws. In England every man's life, liberty, and property is guarded and defended by the law, and no one has a right to moleſt or diſturb the meaneſt perſon in the quiet poſſeſſion and enjoyment thereof. But every one owes a full and juſt obedience to the laws that protect him, and by his tranſgreſſing them may forfeit his liberty, property, and life. Such puniſhments are diſgraceful to human nature it is true, but the diſgrace originates with and cleaves to the tranſgreſſors, and not the Government which inflicts the puniſhment. The diſgrace therefore may juſtly belong to the

Corſicans,

Corſicans, who may have been the tranſgreſſors, and not to the *Genoeſe*, whoſe juſt rights to obedience may have been violated, and therefore had a right to cede them to the *French*, as the moſt effectual means of doing juſtice to themſelves.

This reaſoning applies with equal force againſt the Americans, if they are of right the ſubjects of the King of Great Britain, and as ſuch he has a right of dominion and ſovereignty over them. As his ſubjects they have a right to the protection of the Britiſh laws, in their lives, liberty, and property; but like other ſubjects, they may forfeit their rights, and become the juſt objects of puniſhment. Great Britain can exerciſe no authority over any of its ſubjects but what is agreeable to the laws; it cannot, therefore, make a ceſſion of its ſubjects to any other Power or Government upon earth. But if its ſubjects refuſe their allegiance, and rebel againſt Government, they forfeit all the rights of ſubjects, and become the juſt objects of puniſhment. In ſuch caſe Government has a right to *cede* rebellious ſubjects to *France*, or any other Power it may be for its intereſt to do. To ſay otherwiſe, is to maintain that Government may inflict the greateſt of all puniſhments, but

cannot inflict a leſs. Let not this, however, be falſely called one country exerciſing a dreadful power over another. The idea is falſe and without foundation. *Britain* aims at no unjuſt exertion of power in *America*, it requires no more than a juſt obedience to its laws. If its authority is contemned, its rights violated, and the execution of its laws oppoſed by force, and acts of open rebellion, it becomes its duty to puniſh the offenders in ſuch way, and by ſuch means, as are moſt convenient and practicable. If circumſtances render it impracticable to puniſh them by its own force, it has an undoubted right to procure the aſſiſtance of any power on earth for that purpoſe; and, finally, if all other methods prove ineffectual, to *cede* them to any power whatever that will beſt comport with its intereſt.

"Had the Colonies been communities of *Foreigners*, over whom we wanted to acquire dominion, or even to extend a dominion before acquired, their reſiſtance would (*certainly*) have been juſt." But the reſiſtance of the Colonies to the dominion of the Government which has a right to their ſubjection, renders them obnoxious to the laws, and to the puniſhment due to Rebels; and to ſay the contrary, in my opinion, is the

ſame

ſame with ſaying, that there is no difference between right and wrong, obedience and diſobedience, the peaceable ſubmiſſion of dutiful ſubjects, and the refractory and rebellious oppoſition of undutiful ſubjects, who ſet all right at defiance, and who are, notwithſtanding, equally entitled to every mark of favour and protection as their own dutiful *brethren*. Are the Colonies worſe off than the reſt of mankind, becauſe their ſubmiſſion is required where it is of right due? whereas, of the reſt of mankind it is not required, becauſe it is not due? It is juſt the ſame as ſaying, it is hard upon A that he is compelled to pay a debt that he owes, becauſe B is not alſo compelled to pay a debt he does not owe. It is very eaſy, from the hiſtory of mankind, to cull out many execrable examples of tyranny and oppreſſion, and to ſlander the beſt conſtitution by unrighteous compariſon; but this proves nothing but malevolence, and want of truth in the Writer. Had Government imagined that the Rebels abroad would have met with ſuch traiterous encouragement at home, they would have been better provided before they had made the attempt; but it is not to be doubted, that their diſappointment is more owing to the falſe hearts of the latter than the true courage of the former.

The diſgraceful manner the Doctor obſerves in which this war has been conducted, puts me in mind of a finical ſweet-ſcented fellow, who complained of the rudeneſs of his neighbours when his houſe was on fire, for extinguiſhing the flames with dirty water. Parricides forfeit all claims not only to the law of nations, but to the rights of humanity.

SECTION V.

Of the PROBABILITY *of ſucceeding in the* WAR *with* AMERICA.

THIS Section is nothing more than an enthuſiaſtic panegyric on the wiſdom, virtue, courage, and devotion of the Americans, and virulent declamation againſt the folly, vices, timidity, irreligion, and injuſtice of Britons. The former, according to him, are *ſaints*, and the latter *devils*. "None who know the Doctor can believe him to be diſpoſed to ſuperſtition," but, "perhaps in the preſent inſtance, he is not free from this weakneſs; he fancies he ſees ſomething that cannot be accounted for by human ignorance;" others, more than fancy he ſees ſomething, that cannot be accounted for by human underſtanding. He ſees what no

no one elſe can ſee, and what others ſee he cannot ſee. He ſees that *natural* liberty is *civil*, and civil liberty is *ſlavery*. That man cannot be bound by any laws but thoſe of his own making; and if he is reſtrained from following his own will, and doing as he pleaſes, he is robbed of his liberty. That dominion and ſovereignty imply not ſubjection and obedience, and are nothing more than pompous ſounds, annexed to Majeſty, without any meaning. That Laws are made for Governors by the governed, and that the former have no right to act but as they are directed by the latter. Among a thouſand other ſtrange things, he thinks he ſees the hand of Providence working to bring about ſome great ends! What theſe ends are he does not here tell us; but it is eaſy to collect from his book, that a principal one is, that *America* will become a great and mighty empire, renowned for its wiſdom, virtue, courage, and ſanctity: That *Great Britain* will dwindle into a pigmie province, and receive its laws, and pay tribute to *America*. There is another thing one may imagine he ſees, which he may be too modeſt to acknowledge, which is, that one of the great ends which the hand of Providence is working to bring about, may be, to make the Doctor the METROPOLITAN over thoſe

FAST-

FASTING, PRAYING, immaculate ſaints, from one end of *North America* to the other. This is an end to which he may look animated with hope, if not with piety, without pain to the iſſue, and perhaps better ſecured than hanging by a thread.

What ſtrange notions have we poor mortals of the Divine Being? A race of ungrateful and rebellious people, too proud to be governed, and too enterprizing to be honeſt, with amazing audacity ſets Government at defiance, oppoſes violence to right, and endeavour to plunge their ſwords into the boſom of their parent, and to inſure a ſucceſs equal to their iniquity, they think to bribe Heaven on their ſide by the affected grimace of faſting, and to teize it to aid the unnatural cauſe of rebellion, by a daring multiplicity of ſupplications. There never was a more abſurd nor preſumptuous notion conceived by the mind of man, than to ſupplicate the Deity to aid and aſſiſt him in the gratification of his pride, luſts, and follies, and to grant his requeſts, though founded in injuſtice and cruelty, and then fooliſhly call this devotion, aud anxiouſly expect and depend upon the bleſſings which are its rewards.

The people of *America* are no more the ſubjects of the people of *Britain*, than the people

people of *Britain* are the ſubjects of the people of *America*. The plain anſwer is, they are both equally the ſubjects of one and the ſame Government, and equal obedience is due from each.

We are taxed, not by ourſelves, but by the Legiſlature, which has the ſame right to tax them. Our Government is their Government, which, in juſtice, is to be ſupported by all. Our ſeveral Corporations, &c. have immunities and privileges peculiar to each, but that does not excuſe them from the obligations of the laws which are common to all. If purchaſing our manufactures is paying our taxes, is not our purchaſing their produce paying theirs? Our Parliament and our Laws are their Parliament and their Laws, as far as they reſpect them, and if they will not obey, our Legiſlature has not only the right, but it is its duty to coerce them to obedience; and if it has not adequate power in itſelf, it has a right to call in the aid of any Power it can, and finally to puniſh their rebellion, by ceding them to any other Power that may be moſt conducive to its own ſafety and intereſt.

It is true, they are reſtrained from dealing with others; but how?—More by acts of

of bounty, generoſity, and kindneſs, than laws of coercion. Can they diſpoſe of their produce upon terms equally advantageous to themſelves in any part of the world beſides Britain? What country beſides would give them a bounty on tar, pitch, turpentine, hemp, flax, indigo, timber, and almoſt every article they bring to our market? Upon Eaſt India goods we pay from twenty-five to fifty per cent. upon all we conſume; upon Hambro' linens, and Dutch manufactures, from twenty to forty or fifty per cent. But upon what we ſell them, the cuſtoms and exciſes are drawn back, and they are releaſed from every part of the burthen. Yea more, we have not only borne their ſhare of the taxes, but we pay a part of the value of every yard of cloth we ſell them, the manufacture of England, Scotland, or Ireland, from 6d. to 18d. per yard, and that in the proportion of from eight to ſixteen or ſeventeen per cent.

From hence it appears, there is nothing ſo prepoſterous or abſurd, in the phraſe, *our Colonies*, ſo common in the mouths of the people; for though it is abſurd to ſuppoſe that the people of the Colonies are ſubjects of the people here, it is conſiſtent with truth and good ſenſe to ſay, that our people have an *equitable intereſt* in all they poſſeſs,

if

if a valuable conſideration given can create ſuch an intereſt. There is not a *day labourer* in the kingdom who helped not to pay this bounty, and if by ſome means or other he is not entitled to an equivalent, it was cruel and unjuſt to take away any part of his property to give it to them.

That they have no voice in our *Parliament*, no ſhare in making our *Laws*, is not true, as we have already ſhewn. Thoſe who poſſeſs the ſame qualifications have an equal right with Britons, and may exerciſe that right as often as opportunities offer. But thoſe who have no qualification, have no right, yet enjoy Liberty as perfectly as thoſe who have. It would be the reverſe of Liberty, for one who has no property, to have a right to diſpoſe of another's who has. As many of them may have voices in our Parliament as think proper to qualify themſelves for that purpoſe, at leaſt they would ſtand an equal chance with Britons. Their land, themſelves, and their property, are equally repreſented with us and ours; and the contrary can only be ſaid, by putting a *falſe* conſtruction on the word *repreſentation*. But the ſophiſtry and falſhood of this have already been fully refuted.

Throughout the whole of this performance, *Right* is made to exiſt no longer than it can be ſupported by *Power*. " If the Coloniſts are now aiming at independence, is it to be wondered at, if they can ſubſiſt without you? Did there ever exiſt a community, or even an individual, that would not do the ſame?" Is not this the ſame as ſaying, that obligation remains no longer than till the perſon bound has power ſufficient to break it, and that *communities* and *individuals* are juſtified in rebelling againſt all authority, by the general practice of mankind. What opinion muſt we entertain of the virtuous principles of our *Patriotic Author*. Freemen, who violate the Laws and rebel againſt Government, muſt be governed by force, and dragooned into compliance, or hanged, and their eſtates confiſcated, if their obſtinacy render it neceſſary. Who is to blame, the Malefactor who breaks the laws, or the Legiſlature which puniſhes him? Freedom is no protection for *Criminals*, nor can it exiſt where they are ſuffered to eſcape unpuniſhed. Liberty can exiſt no where, but by the protection of the laws.

CONCLU-

Conclusion.

The end of Government is to maintain peace and ſecure the happineſs of the people. This is to be effected only by juſt and equal laws impartially adminiſtred. As each individual is equally protected by the law, each muſt bear a proportionable ſhare of the expence neceſſary to that purpoſe. Every ſubject therefore is of right bound to contribute a proportionable ſhare towards the public expence. Theſe are truths too evident to be denied. The whole diſpute then between Great Britain and the Colonies reſts upon this; Whether the King of Great Britain has the Sovereignty or Right of Dominion over the Colonies; or Whether the Coloniſts are of right the ſubjects of the King of Great Britain. If not, all our claims are founded in injuſtice, and every act to eſtabliſh ſuch claims, is an act of oppreſſion. On the other hand, if they are his ſubjects, the claims of the Legiſlature are founded in right and juſtice, and they are as much bound by the laws of the Britiſh Parliament, as the ſubjects who reſide in Great Britain.

Upon the ſolution of this eaſy queſtion, the whole merits of the diſpute between us depend. A queſtion to which the Doctor's reaſoning in no ſenſe applies. Inſtead of enquiring into the circumſtances which conſtitute the relation between the two countries, out of which the true queſtion ariſes, he chooſes to try the queſtion by the abſtract ideas of the inherent rights of men. That is, he choſe to try the rights of Civil Liberty, or of men in Civil Society, by the rights of natural freedom, which are as extenſive as the will; the rights of thoſe who are bound by the laws, by the rights of thoſe who have no laws to bind them. Surely, never man ſo earneſtly buffeted and ſtrove with a ſhadow.

If it ſhould, however, be thought, that any part of his argument is levelled at this right, *all* that he may have ſaid is refuted by himſelf, if he meant any thing (beſides miſleading the Reader) in quoting the words of that excellent Stateſman, the EARL OF SHELBURNE, who maintains the right of Great Britain over the Colonies in terms as ſtrong as words can deſcribe them. Having mentioned the Acts which he thought it prudent to repeal, he ſays, "There will be found

found much matter which both countries may wiſh repealed. *Some* which can never be given up, the principle being that regulation of trade, for the common good of the Empire, which forms our *Palladium.*—Preſcribe the moſt explicit acknowledgment of your *right* of regulating commerce in its moſt extenſive ſenſe.—Beſides the power of regulating the general commerce of the Empire, ſomething further might be expected, &c.—To be more explicit; the debt of *England,* without entering into invidious diſtinctions how it came to be contracted, might be acknowledged the debt of every individual part of the whole Empire, Aſia as well as America included, &c.—Always ſuppoſing the laws of trade duly obſerved and enforced." If Great Britain has no right of dominion in America, on what are "thoſe Acts founded, *which can never be given up?*" *Can an explicit acknowledgment of right be preſcribed, where no right exiſts?—Can the debt of England, by any means, be acknowledged indiſcriminately the debt of America independent of right?—Can a right to ſee the laws of trade duly obſerved and enforced, ſubſiſt where there is no right to enact ſuch laws?* Can words more explicitly deſcribe any right?

What

What may be the event of the war, God only knows; eminently dreadful to both countries no one can doubt. Much are all thoſe to blame, and have to anſwer for, who have ſpirited up, and encouraged the rebellion. Had it not been for them, all might now have been at peace, and in the pleaſing road to proſperity. To accept of any terms of accommodation ſhort of legiſlative right, and the dutiful ſubmiſſion of ſubjects, would be to renounce the rights of the Britiſh dominion, and to eſtabliſh a precedent never to be revoked. *America muſt now be ſubdued or loſt.* I ſincerely wiſh, however, the ſword had never been drawn; not that I think it unjuſt, but that a milder method would have ſucceeded better. Had they been left to their own choice, either to have ſubmitted as dutiful ſubjects, or have forfeited all hope of future friendſhip and protection, I cannot entertain a doubt but they would gladly have returned to their duty as ſubjects of Great Britain. Their greateſt enemies here, now covered with the maſque of friendſhip, who animated them into rebellion, would then have been the firſt to have adviſed them to a dutiful ſubmiſſion, and perfect reconciliation. But the ſword is now drawn, and the ſcabbard thrown away,

away, and nothing remains but CONQUEST OR CESSION. The SPIRIT, which is too refractory for the mild reſtraints of CIVIL LIBERTY, may be forced to yield to the GALLING CHAINS OF GALLIC SLAVERY.

FINIS.